

the alcoholic-beverage stage. In some countries only the leaders in thought voice this sentiment, but their statements are significant.

Cardinal Mercier, primate of Belgium, said, in 1919:

"If general prohibition were introduced more lives would be saved than by general disarmament. Alcohol kills more men than war and kills them dishonorably. An existence is suppressed when a man is killed by war; but the evil survives after the inebriate ceases to exist."

To those who believe they are advocating temperance when they oppose prohibition, I would say only this—there is more temperance under prohibition than there was before prohibition. And the experience of Canada in trying the half-march back by State liquor selling is more pleasant as pictured by wet propagandists than in the views of Canadian authorities.

I quote a few views as reported recently in *The Manufacturers Record*, published in Baltimore:

Ontario liquor board: "Ontario is buying liquor at the rate of \$1,000,000 a week."

Alberta liquor board: "In Alberta 4,000,000 gallons liquor sold in second year of 'control.'"

Quebec liquor commission: "Sales of beer increased 1,000,000 gallons over last year."

Reports of the seven liquor control boards: "The seven Provinces having 'Government control,' with a population of 10,000,000, spend \$160,000,000 a year for liquor."

British Columbia liquor board: "Since the opening of the beer parlors the sales of 'hard liquor' have increased 50 per cent."

Quebec liquor commission, 1924-25: "Sales of hard spirits increased 32,275 gallons in one year."

Nor does Canada's experience indicate that the bootlegger exists only where there is prohibition—a fact that we knew before we had national prohibition, but some of us appear to have forgotten. The Saskatchewan liquor board reports: "Bootlegging increased 111 per cent the first year."

Says the Columbia liquor board: "As much liquor is sold by bootleggers as is sold in the Government stores."

"One of the most astonishing transformations in economic history is the progress made in industry in the United States during the last five years," wrote Secretary Hoover in the 1925 annual report of the United States Department of Commerce. As President he has not changed his attitude in favor of prohibition's economic benefits. Rather the contrary, Mr. Hoover mentioned prohibition as one of the chief causes of that transformation, and few big manufacturers in the United States will disagree with that statement.

A CAUSE OF PROSPERITY

I think we can lay a considerable share of this Nation's abounding good fortune to eight years of national prohibition superimposed on many more years of prohibition by the States; to the tremendous increase in our industrial efficiency resulting largely therefrom; to the rise in the last eight years of a new and hitherto lacking nation-wide thrift, which seems but another outcome of this same cause, and which, as President Hoover points out, finds us in this year of our Lord the best-housed, the best-fed, the best-clothed people that ever inhabited the earth.

If the opponents of prohibition succeed in bringing back the sale of wine and beer, the lawbreaking saloon will as surely come back as that water will run down hill.

We need go no further back than the recent election to discover that the great majority of the people of this country—not any particular section or class or party, but just the mass of the people—believe in the eighteenth amendment and in the enforcement of its provisions. To my mind, the national election of 1928 constitutes a mandate to the Government of the United States to make the prohibition amendment effective, not to attempt to repeal or evade it.

As a business man and as Governor of my home State of Kansas, I have seen various experiments tried to regulate the drink evil—high license, local option, State dispensaries. Prohibition honestly enforced has by far proved the most effective remedy, and national prohibition was the logical outcome after half a century of experimenting.

I wish to repeat, it is not a change back to the free use of intoxicating liquor that we need, but fair and square prohibition enforcement.

No friend of prohibition need worry over the recent agitation started by Senator BORAH's pronouncement that stricter enforcement is needed. The result of this criticism, from one of the most sincere and ardent drys in the country, of certain laxities in law enforcement, hailed at first by the "wets" as a set-back for law enforcement, will result only in stricter law enforcement. In fact, my information is that this already is becoming apparent.

GROWING DISREGARD FOR LAW

Prohibition is not now so much a question of laws or changes in laws. It is rather a question of law observance and law enforcement. The growing disregard for law is a danger signal that we can not afford to ignore. Gang wars and wholesale murder—more than 9,000 murders a year in this country; crimes of violence on the increase; cynical dis-

respect for all constituted authority apparently more prevalent in our boys and girls; these accompanied by the slackened sense of individual responsibility to which I have already referred.

This situation is not peculiar to the United States, although our rapid development industrially and the transition period through which we are traveling at the highest speed ever known in the history of the world have accentuated the growing lack of law observance and slackening of law enforcement.

A large contributing factor toward the breakdown of law observance and law enforcement is the lawless fight being waged against the eighteenth amendment by those who desire the return of the saloon.

This issue must be faced squarely. Our citizenship must realize the problems involved.

The issue is clear cut. We will have either law enforcement or the open saloon. The open saloon will never return so long as our citizens keep their vision clear on that fundamental fact.

There has been no change of sentiment among our farmers nor among the urban dwellers of the United States where the real issue is understood on this question. But powerful selfish interests have clouded the issue. The forces back of law and order should realize this and hammer home that the real clear-cut issue—the law enforcement and law observance fight—in the last analysis is over the saloon.

Every citizen and every community faces the same challenge.

For every citizen, the challenge individually is that of law observance. For every community, the challenge is law enforcement.

But the citizen has also the duty of backing up law enforcement, not only with individual law observance but by throwing his influence behind the enforcement of law—not just the law against murder, and theft, and other crimes of violence, but also against the crime of violating the eighteenth amendment and its enforcement statutes. If we do not want the law, there is a lawful way to bring about its repeal; but the law should be respected and obeyed until it is repealed.

I say without the slightest hesitation that the farmer and his family will be on the side of law observance and law enforcement. He is fundamentally sound and right on this question. But he, as well as every other citizen, must realize that the matter of law observance and law enforcement is a battle, not an argument. And every ounce of good citizenship in this country must answer the challenge fairly, without equivocation or evasion, if this civilization of ours is to endure.

No act of President Hoover's administration has received more heartfelt and general support than his stand for law observance and law enforcement, particularly with reference to prohibition.

Prohibition enforcement now is a challenge to public officials—Federal, State, and local—from one end of the land to the other. It is a challenge also to the loyalty of the common man to his Government. We have never had a greater opportunity to do a finer service for our country than to-day—by showing through speech and action a decent respect for its laws and its Constitution.

Prohibition has not had a fair trial. The big cities have not made an honest effort to enforce this law. It should be given a chance. It can be enforced if Federal, State, and local officials will get back of it in an honest-to-God way.

The American people have a right to disapprove of a law and to seek its repeal or modification in a lawful way. If the people do not want prohibition, they may remove the amendment by the same means they used to adopt it. If a majority of the people of the country desire the Volstead Act changed, they have a legal method of accomplishing this result through electing to the House and Senate Members who will vote to change it. Liquor has never obeyed any modifying law. It will never obey any law but a bone-dry law, honestly and vigorously enforced.

I believe prohibition is gaining in spite of the difficulties of enforcement. The eighteenth amendment will never come out of the Constitution. The Volstead law will not be weakened. In years to come the people of the United States will have more and more cause to rejoice that they voted prohibition into the Constitution and made it the law of the land and stood by it.

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess, the recess being until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until to-morrow, Thursday, January 30, 1930, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 29 (legislative day of January 6), 1930

Capt. Julian Wallace Cunningham, Cavalry, to be major, Cavalry, Regular Army, with rank from January 21, 1930.

WITHDRAWAL

Capt. Julian Weeks Cunningham to be major, Cavalry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, January 29, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Mr. TILSON as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the Father of all humanity; so with diligence and courage we will do our duty and go straight forward. Whatever may happen, may we be determined to overcome all difficulties. Encourage us to be good, brave, and kind-hearted, deserving the honor the Republic has shown us. The Lord God be with our country, and may our citizens ever be wise to the fact that the strength of a nation is in the intelligent, well-ordered homes of the people. In our labor and toil—yes, even in the crises of life—if all else fails, O may our hearthstones reinforce us with that faith and hope that nothing can disturb. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5616. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business to-day be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next it may be in order to call the Private Calendar and consider bills not objected to in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next it may be in order to call the Private Calendar and consider bills not objected to in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPORT CONCERNING A NAVAL AIRSHIP BASE

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 119

Resolved, That House Document No. 132, this Congress, being a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the selection of locations deemed most suitable for a naval airship base, as transmitted to Congress on December 4, 1929, be reprinted with certain corrections, and that 500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 217.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it by title. The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 217) making an additional appropriation for the support of the Federal Radio Commission during the fiscal year 1930, in accordance with the act approved December 18, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, let us have it read. Then we can determine better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year

1930 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Radio Commission as continued by the act approved December 18, 1929, namely:

For an additional amount for the pay of five commissioners at the rate of \$10,000 each per annum, \$50,000.

For an additional amount for all other authorized expenses of the Federal Radio Commission in performing the duties imposed by the radio act of 1927, as amended, including personal services, newspapers and periodicals, law and reference books, special counsel fees, printing and binding, supplies and equipment which, when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$25, may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), contract stenographic reporting services without reference to such section, travel and other necessary expenses, \$26,000; and in addition thereto, \$75,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Federal Radio Commission, 1927-1929," is hereby reappropriated and made available for the purposes of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Federal Radio Commission, 1930," all to be retroactive to the date of the approval of such act of December 18, 1929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. WOOD. It was unanimously favored by the subcommittee on deficiencies and at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations a few days ago it was brought to our attention. We were instructed to report it to the House without further report from the full committee.

Mr. GARNER. Could it not be attended to on the general deficiency bill?

Mr. WOOD. This is of extraordinary importance at the present moment. The general deficiency bill will not be reported until some time later. This will be needed before next Saturday, as the commission otherwise would be without funds at that time. That is the reason why we are not reserving it for the general deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have to announce that there will be a meeting in Washington of the rehabilitation committee of the American Legion on February 1, 2, and 3 in the Bond Building, a committee of which Capt. Watson B. Miller is chairman. The members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation have been invited, and the Members of the House are cordially invited to attend.

MAJ. CHARLES M. STEDMAN

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the indulgence of the House for a brief period to call attention to the fact that this is the eighty-ninth anniversary or birthday of our distinguished colleague and beloved friend, Major STEDMAN, of North Carolina.

Major STEDMAN and I entered this body simultaneously in the Sixty-second Congress and have served continuously together since that time. During these 19 momentous years no Member of this body has served with greater distinction or higher degree of fidelity to the public welfare than Major STEDMAN. Neither has any Member contributed more to the pride, dignity, and honor of the Republic or rendered a finer quality of patriotic service in every sense of the word. He typifies the highest type of American citizenship. Whether as a private or major serving under the immortal Lee, in that unfortunate struggle between the States; or as an able and honored member of the bar of North Carolina; or holding many high and important public offices in his native State; or as a Member of this body for so long a period of time, he has by his great ability, courtly manners, conscientious devotion to duty, his assiduous and untiring energy rendered a service that has commanded national recognition, approval, and admiration.

The words "gentleman" and "statesman" are sometimes used formally and carelessly, but in no individual whom it has ever

been my privilege to know are these words more fully exemplified, typified, and personified than in the life of our honored and beloved colleague, Major STEDMAN. [Applause.] Never selfish or provincial in his consideration of public matters, never even stopping to inquire how any question would affect his individual welfare or district, but the only consideration by which he is ever guided and controlled is, Is it right and will it promote the general welfare? Duty is ever his guiding motive.

I know it is deeply regretted by every Member of this body as well as the entire country that Major STEDMAN has decided not to again be a candidate for Congress. So insistent and determined were his constituents and the country that he continue his work here, that he had to make three separate and emphatic statements that he would not again be a candidate before his decision would be accepted and before anyone in his district would become a candidate to succeed him. Major STEDMAN feels and those nearest and dearest to him feel that he is entitled to a much needed rest, and that it would be more conducive to his well-being and happiness to spend the remaining years of his life after the expiration of his present term among his North Carolina friends, free from the duties and responsibilities of public life.

I have often heard Major STEDMAN express his deep sense of gratitude for the many courtesies shown him by every Member of this House, and especially by our able and impartial Speaker. He is one of the most appreciative men I have ever known.

It is my sincere wish, as I know it is of the membership of this House and the entire country, that health and happiness may be vouchsafed to you, Major STEDMAN, for many years yet to come, and that when your life's work is concluded you may hear a welcoming voice from the distant shore saying, "Come, ye blest of my Father, and inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank my friend, Mr. DOUGHTON, for his kind words. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, unless the time is otherwise provided for, I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak for 45 minutes, or as much of that time as is needed, next Tuesday morning, on how the attempt to make a tariff bill in 1929 looks to one Member of the House, and with particular reference to what we are going to do about the Tariff Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes next Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] requested me to ask for 30 minutes for himself on that occasion, he desiring to discuss something that is very much germane to what I am going to say.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] may be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of his address on Tuesday next. Is there objection?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just wish to offer the suggestion that that day has been set aside for the Private Calendar, and we will not make much headway with that calendar if we take up a great deal of time. Would not some other day be agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I think it might not be, because he wishes to talk about something germane to my discussion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no desire to interfere with his purpose to address the House, but the Private Calendar does not come up for consideration very often.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORK OF THE ITALIAN ARTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including a very carefully prepared and interesting address made by Charles E. Fairman, curator of art of the Capitol, before the Italy-America Society of the City of Washington, on January 22, 1930.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an address delivered by the curator of art of the Capitol. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following very carefully prepared and interesting address made by Mr. Charles E.

Fairman, curator of art of the Capitol, before the Italy-America Society of the City of Washington on January 22, 1930, containing valuable historical information relating to the work of the Italian sculptors upon the United States Capitol in the year 1806, and tracing the art development of the Capitol from that early date, information of such a nature that its publication is warranted for the purpose of the preservation of these facts of history never before published and constituting an important addition to the history of the United States Capitol.

The address is as follows:

ART OF THE ITALIAN ARTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Monday afternoon, February 24, 1806, cold as are all days of February of that date, frozen ground, snow in patches by the roadside, murmurings of the cold wind through the open spaces in the woods lining the roadway leading from Baltimore, Md., over this road a stagecoach is proceeding toward Washington.

On this afternoon 124 years ago the stagecoach was occupied with four passengers from Carrara, Italy, completing a journey of 146 days since their departure from Leghorn, Italy, where they had received their final instructions from the United States consul at their port of embarkation on October 1, 1805. These passengers were Giovanni Andrei, with his wife; Giuseppe Franzoni, with his wife; people destined to exert a lasting influence upon the art of the Capitol of the United States.

What a disappointment awaited them as they entered the city of Washington, then a city in name, not in its meager population; and this disappointment increased as they saw the Capitol Building, then consisting of a rectangular building now known as the Supreme Court section of the present Capitol. To the south of this plain rectangular building was a vacant space, that of East Capitol Street extended in a westerly direction; south of East Capitol Street could be seen the partially constructed portion of another rectangular building, intended to duplicate the Supreme Court section in area and cubic dimension—the future home of the Hall of the House of Representatives—destined to be the most beautiful hall of the entire Capitol, and now designated as the Statuary Hall section of the Capitol.

The sensation of these foreign people as they contemplated the unfinished condition of the Capitol Building, and the very small settlement representing the Capital City, must have been one of increased disappointment as these conditions were contrasted with those of their home country, Italy, and to make matters far more embarrassing they could find no one who spoke the Italian language, and their inquiries were met with a shake of the head or a questioning shrug of the shoulder, and then they reflected that they were under contract to remain amid these crude surroundings for two years, and we may imagine that Mrs. Franzoni mourned for her native Italy and the little daughter left in the home country.

Where was this wonderful President Jefferson of whom Philip Mazzei had related so many anecdotes? Where was the Architect Latrobe whose letter containing so many alluring promises had been the cause of their leaving Italy to test their fortunes in this new country? Who was to be found who could speak the Italian language and tell them where they were to spend the night and where they might locate their home? None but those who have been alone in some city where their language was not understood, where people stared in open-mouthed astonishment at their questions, can properly sense the loneliness of these strangers in a place where they had been given to understand they would be gladly welcomed.

But it may be said by some, "these are only sculptors who have heard of the proposed Capitol Building and are here seeking work," and add to this opinion that it is very strange that they should start on such an adventure. "Why did not they remain at home where work was probably found far more easily." But you are wrong. These people were not of the migratory class seeking employment. Giovanni Andrei was a decorative sculptor of high attainments and had shown his ability in the balustrade of the high altar of the Church of St. Maria de Novella, of Florence. He was the brother-in-law of Giuseppe Franzoni, whom he had taught and in whom he had seen develop high talent as a sculptor of figures. Franzoni was the son of a distinguished sculptor, the president of the art institute of his native city of Carrara. His uncle, Cardinal Franzoni, was at one time largely supported as a candidate for the papal office of Rome. They were far more than craftsmen of notable ability; they were of distinguished parentage. Why did they come to Washington, you may ask. It is a long story and must be briefly told.

In the year 1773 Philip Mazzei, in company with other Italians, came to Virginia in the hope of introducing the cultivation of the grape, olive, and other Italian fruits in Albemarle County, Va. Mazzei, a physician of Tuscany, deeply devoted to agriculture as well as fruit raising, had for a neighbor Thomas Jefferson, then living at Shadwell, and deeply interested in agriculture and engaged in experimental agricultural work of which he was keeping careful records. Jefferson found in Mazzei a man of ability and wise counsel, and some of his farm records show attempts of the cultivation of vegetables recorded under their Italian names, thus proving the assistance of Mazzei in his experiments.

It is safe to say that art as well as agriculture was discussed by these friends, and that after the passing of the years and the attainment to the Presidency by Jefferson that he remembered his friend of earlier years and suggested to Latrobe the advisability of securing the aid of Philip Mazzei, then returned to his native country, in the selection of artists to aid in the decoration of the portion of the Capitol Building to be later occupied by the House of Representatives. In accordance with the suggestion of President Jefferson, Benjamin H. Latrobe then Architect of the Capitol, on March 6, 1805, wrote to Philip Mazzei, asking for his assistance in the selection of a decorative sculptor, describing the work contemplated, also asking for the selection of a sculptor of figures, specifying that they were to be men of good morals, single men preferred, but if married, their families should accompany them, providing for their transportation and subsistence at the expense of the Government, and naming the United States consul at Leghorn, Italy, as the official who should ratify the selection, provide transportation, and attend to other details relating to their voyage to the city of Washington. Two letters from Mazzei to Latrobe, one of July 20, 1805, the other of September 1, 1805, are referred to in the journal or letter books of Benjamin H. Latrobe, which include 18 large books containing polygraph copies of the letters of Latrobe, but the letters from Mazzei seem to have been lost or mislaid, so that at best we have but a one-sided view of the correspondence. The answer, however, to the request that two sculptors be sent was the appearance on February 24, 1806, of Andrei and Franzoni.

The clerk of the works, as the official, John Lenthall, was named, notified Latrobe, then absent from the city upon engineering work then under his charge in addition to his duties as the Architect of the Capitol, of the arrival of Andrei and Franzoni. This letter is dated February 25, 1806, to which Latrobe replied, March 3, 1806, stating that he will "trump all his Italian" and write them on the following day so as to keep them good natured.

In the meanwhile Andrei and Franzoni had not been idle. Having located suitable clay for modeling they had set themselves at work at modeling in clay, showing that they had well learned the lesson that work is the best remedy for the blues or homesickness.

It is quite probable that Philip Mazzei had sent by Franzoni some message to his former friend Jefferson, for we find that Franzoni called upon President Jefferson and left some articles of marble as a present, no doubt feeling that this was but a proper evidence of his respect to one who had been such a warm friend in former years of Philip Mazzei. The reply of President Jefferson explains far better than any transcript of the letter the attitude of the President toward his Italian visitor. The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, March 2, 1806.

SIR: I did not understand until told so by the servant at the door that the articles of marble which you had left here were intended as presents to me. Be assured that I receive this mark of your good will as thankfully as if I could accept of it, but I have laid it down as a law to myself to accept no presents of value while I am in public office, and adherence to this rule is necessary for the tranquillity of my own mind and it is necessary for the public good.

These motives can not fail to meet your approbation and to justify my request that you receive the objects back again, and with the same thanks for the offer as if I had retained them. Be assured that I shall avail myself of every occasion of being useful to you, and accept my salutations.

MR. FRANZONI.

The offer of usefulness does not seem to be the simple use of a well-placed phrase, for we find that on March 5, 1807, the President writes Mr. Franzoni as follows:

"Thomas Jefferson informs Mr. Franzoni that he had inquiry made into the subject of his two statues, and he now incloses him the information from the collector of Baltimore. By this he will perceive that to obtain a more proper appraisement Mr. Franzoni must appoint an appraiser and the collector another, who will estimate them on such evidence as Mr. Franzoni can give of their value; but he will see that there is no time to be lost as they are advertised to be sold on the 12th instant. If Mr. Franzoni needs further information, he had better wait on Mr. Duvel with an interpreter. Mr. Jefferson salutes Mr. Franzoni with esteem."

It would indeed be interesting if it were possible to learn the fate of the statues advertised to be sold on March 12, 1807, or to know the subjects of the "articles of marble" declined by President Jefferson in his note of March 2, 1806. So little is really known on this subject that there seems to be no clue by which these objects may be traced.

I do not think, however, that there can be any doubt but that President Jefferson was a staunch friend of Giuseppe Franzoni. It is claimed by some of his descendants that he was a frequent visitor at the White House and often dined on Sunday evenings with President Jefferson, and that Mrs. Franzoni was given a silver sugar dish made as a special order from President Jefferson for a Christmas present for Mrs. Giuseppe Franzoni, and that the same has been deposited for exhibition purposes in the museum of the Philadelphia Historical Society.

These statements are related in order that it may be known to what extent the claim is made of the friendship of President Jefferson.

I have given considerable space to the historical facts concerning Giuseppe Franzoni for the reason that of the two sculptors his part seems to be the most prominent. Unfortunately, his works were destroyed by the fire when the Capitol was captured by the British August 24, 1814, with this exception: In the vestibule entrance to the law library of the Supreme Court there are six columns known as the corn-stalk columns, referred to by Latrobe as the work of Franzoni. These columns escaped damage by the fire of 1814, and while they are from a design by Latrobe they were executed by Giuseppe Franzoni. It is known that Franzoni was the sculptor of a statue of Liberty in the Hall of the House of Representatives destroyed in August, 1814, and that there were also in the gallery of this Hall, or on the gallery front, figures representing agriculture, art, science, and commerce. The small models of these figures were sent to Charles Willson Peale for an exhibition at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts in 1808, as shown by a letter from B. H. Latrobe to Peale, dated December 10, 1808, from which the following extract states:

"* * * I send to the Academy of Arts four boxes containing the four figures—agriculture, art, science, and commerce—which are sculptured in alto-relievo over the entrance of the Hall of Representatives here. They occupy 25 feet in length in the original and are rather larger than life. * * * These are the original small models. * * *"

I have been unable to find any record of the exhibition of these models or of the exhibition of 1808-9 in which these models were probably exhibited. Surely they must have aroused interest, for in the year 1808 Giuseppe Franzoni, according to the estimate of Latrobe, was the leading sculptor in the United States.

Giuseppe Franzoni died in Washington, D. C., Thursday, April 6, 1815, leaving a widow and six children surviving him.

Thus far but little has been said of Giovanni Andrei, the brother-in-law and companion of Giuseppe Franzoni on their voyage to the United States in 1806. It appears that at first the Franzoni and Andrei families were quartered in a house where each family had two rooms and a common kitchen for their joint use. The letters of Latrobe, whenever references occur to the two sculptors, fail to disclose anything tending to show that the house was too small or that the families disagreed.

There had been for some time a tendency on the part of Latrobe to complain concerning the length of time taken to complete the work planned for the completion of the Hall of Representatives, and these complaints related particularly to the work of Andrei, whom he characterized as the slowest sculptor he had ever known, stating that his models had cost the Government more than the works executed in marble. Latrobe resigned in 1811, but was recalled after the fire of 1814 to superintend the reconstruction of the two wings and the construction of the central portion of the Capitol. Andrei was sent to Italy by the Government to procure the carving of the Corinthian capitals, now surmounting the columns of Breccia marble in the Statuary Hall section of the Capitol, formerly, and until 1857, the Hall of the House of Representatives. His visit to Italy is referred to in an article published in the Florence Gazette of July 28, 1816, as a letter from Carrara, Italy, as follows:

"The Duchess Maria Beatrice while visiting numerous studios in this city was charmed by the beautiful work being done under the personal direction of Signor Andrei for the Capitol of the United States. The work is being done by Messrs. Franzoni and Casoni; Andrei, an Italian, is at present domiciled in the United States and has returned to Italy for a period of nine months to have created 24 column caps for the main salon of the new Capitol."

The return of Andrei in 1816 was signalized by the introduction of two more Italian sculptors brought here by Andrei under the authority given him to secure additional helpers in the work of the Capitol. Carlo Franzoni, a younger brother of Giuseppe, and Francisco Iardella, said to have been a cousin of the Franzonis and who evidenced his interest in the small Italian colony by his marriage to Camilla Franzoni, the widow of Giuseppe, a former sweetheart of Carrara who had preferred the then prosperous Giuseppe. The six children did not seem to prove a barrier to his affections, and Camilla blessed the marriage by the addition of a daughter and six sons to the household of Iardella.

The work of Iardella, so far as has been recognized in the Capitol, is confined to his tobacco capitals in the small rotunda just north of the main rotunda of the Capitol. The arrangement of the leaves and blossoms is somewhat conventional, but the work is given marked credit by Latrobe, November 5, 1816, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, then at Monticello, in which he refers to the change in the staircase formerly existing in this space and badly injured by the wooden canopy or "lanthorn" falling and burning the stairs so that the removal was necessary. The Rotunda was created with a resemblance to the Clepsidra or temple of the winds, forming a circular colonnade with 16 columns and tobacco capitals supporting a dome, the capitals being an approach to the Corinthian order of architecture in a chamber of the Ionic order. Speaking of Iardella, Latrobe writes:

"Iardella, a sculptor who has just arrived, has made an admirable model for execution in which he has well preserved the botanical char-

acter of the plant, although it has been necessary to enlarge the proportion of the flowers to the leaves and arrange them in clusters of three."

The tobacco capitals are thus identified as the work of Francisco Iardella; other work was merged into the general decorations of the building so that the identity has been lost. Andrei found ample opportunity for his employment in the capitals of the columns of the east central portico, and it is probable that much of the work of Iardella is also represented in these capitals. After Andrei had died in 1824 an appropriation was passed providing funds for the return of his wife to Italy, and it is stated that she made her home in Florence during the remainder of her life. She was the only one of the eight who came to Washington to return to Italy for a residence.

With this brief reference to the work of the two decorative sculptors, Andrei and Iardella, it is now important to give attention to the work of other artists employed at the Capitol during the period of its restoration under Latrobe. It should be understood that the intent of the British to destroy the Hall of the House of Representatives seemed to be greater than that shown in the destruction of the other section, now known as the Supreme Court section. The central portion of the Capitol—the Rotunda—had not been commenced at this time, and the two sections were connected by a walk more than 100 feet in length. Much inflammable material was brought from the Supreme Court section, then the Senate wing of the Capitol, and added to the huge pile of papers, books, and other material on the floor of the Hall of the House of Representatives. This material in burning produced such an intense heat that all the carving of the capitals of the columns, all the relief work of Giuseppe Franzoni, including his immense eagle on the frieze of the Hall, with its outstretched wings measuring 12 feet and 6 inches from tip to tip; his statue of liberty, a seated statue 9 feet in height; his four statues in high relief occupying 25 feet on the frieze, were destroyed, and the columns, frieze, and all of the stonework in Acquia Creek sandstone so badly injured that it had to be removed and replaced with new material. The replacement gave capitals of Italian marble, columns of breccia marble, and a new frieze of Acquia Creek sandstone replaced the old frieze. In addition to this, the form of the Hall was changed from a quadrilateral abutting on two half circles, to the semi-circular hall with its half-dome roof in the practically same condition as we find in Statuary Hall of to-day. It was in this Hall that Giuseppe Valaperti carved his eagle with its wings wide spread as though brooding over the Hall with a spirit of protection. It was in this Hall that Carlo Franzoni, the gifted younger brother of Giuseppe Franzoni, created his Car of History, a group with the Goddess of History standing in the chariot of time recording on the tablets the occurrences of the legislators in the Hall below, one of the most direct appeals ever made to a legislative body in the presentation of the fact that history is recording all that may be said, and it may also be stated that history also records those acts which are not expressed but should be in the interests of the people by whom they have been selected to serve.

It was in this Hall that Pietro Bonanni decorated the half-dome ceiling in a pattern said to have been suggested by the dome of the Pantheon in Rome, showing a craftsmanship so dexterous in the handling of light and shade that the cassions seemed to be in actual relief and intaglio, creating an impression so realistic that those familiar with this ceiling which remained until 1902—when it was replaced in fire-proof material copying the original design—that until one had placed their hand upon this old ceiling it was not believable that the cunning of the artist could produce such a sensation of actual relief.

The work of Bonanni has gone but his ability as an artist is proven by his portrait of Carlo Franzoni, now in the office of the Architect of the Capitol. This portrait was presented to the office of the architect by a great-grandson, Dr. Charles H. Franzoni, of this city. Bonanni died in Washington, D. C., in 1820. Carlo Franzoni died in this city in 1819. His Car of History is believed to be the oldest example of the art of the statuary sculptor in any public building in this city. Sculptors of all schools readily accord it the high place in art, which it richly deserves.

The career of Giuseppe Valaperti is shrouded in mystery. It does not seem that there is much known of his life prior to his coming to this city some time in 1816. Latrobe and Thornton seem to have been impressed with his ability and speak well of his talents in letters addressed to Nathaniel Macon, who had requested advice concerning a sculptor to execute a statue of Washington for the State Capitol of North Carolina. The only work completed in this city of a public character is his eagle now on the frieze of the south side of Statuary Hall. He seems to have been moody in temperament, and possibly somewhat insane. He disappeared on March 4, 1817, and no subsequent trace of him was ever discovered. His unexplained absence for a long time probably was determined by the probate court of this city as proof of death, and his will was admitted to probate, his personal belongings appraised and sold at auction and the proceeds forwarded to his wife, Pillinetta Valaperti, living at the time of the settlement of his estate near Genoa, Italy.

Among other personal belongings were portrait busts in miniature of celebrities of his time. It would be interesting if it might be learned from what source his material was obtained to create these tiny ex-

amples of the sculptor's art. It may be possible that the subjects portrayed sat for their portraits, and it may be that he created these examples of his skill as a modeler from published works by St. Memin, who had executed in profile portraits of a large number of those who were prominent in the affairs of the country at a period prior to that in which Valaperti lived in Washington.

The records of the probate court furnish many interesting facts relating to the two Franzonis, Andrei, Iardella, Bonanni, and Valaperti. Evidently the practice was as though between neighbors, for Washington was a small city at that time.

The passing of Valaperti in 1817, of Carlo Franzoni in 1819, of Pietro Bonanni in 1820, of Giovanni Andrei in 1824, and of Francisco Iardella in 1831 seemed to end the influence that Carrara had held in the direction of art expression in the Capitol. Other artists of Italian birth—Cappalano, of Florence; Causici, of Verona; and Persico, of Naples, who did not measure up to the high standards attained by the artists of the Capitol from Carrara—found employment at the Capitol. While it is true that Persico executed the Statues of Peace and War in the grand portico of the east-central entrance, also the Discovery Group of the south blocking of the entrance stairs and the group in the pediment, seemingly inadequate in composition and in execution. Lacking in the conception of a theme suited for the prominent place occupied, it is equally true that in the mental equipment for thinking out a suitable design or emblem to be expressed in the art of the sculptor, neither Persico, Cappalano, or Causici were possessed of the inspiration which lifts sculpture from the place of craftsmanship to the higher plane of genius. The work of Cappalano in the Preservation of Captain John Smith by Pocahontas, the Landing of the Pilgrims by Enrico Causici, and the fight of Daniel Boone with the Indians by the same artist are unworthy examples of the attempt to Americanize Italian art for the purposes of decorative sculpture. It may be these artists were employed to do exactly the works they executed and that they were done under protest, but, if so, their protest should have been so effective that these works would not be found in a building like our National Capitol.

Cardelli, an Italian sculptor who was employed about the Capitol during the period of the twenties, in his letters, sold at auction only a few years since, blames Bulfinch, the Architect of the Capitol, for his short-sighted attitude toward the decorative art of the Capitol during the time of the erection of the rotunda section of the Capitol.

From the completion of the Capitol in 1828, until the work of the extensions of the Capitol by the additions of the Senate and House wings of the Capitol, art decorations slumbered, except that Greenough added his rescue group to the north blocking of the staircase leading to the central portico, and a seated figure of Washington intended for the rotunda, and, finally, after its erection, removed to the east plaza of the Capitol and later removed to the Smithsonian Institution. Uriah Levy had given to the Congress a bronze statue of Jefferson by the gifted statuary sculptor, David d'Angers, and this statue after its erection in the rotunda was removed to the east grounds of the White House, where it remained until 1874, when it was again erected in the rotunda. Some paintings had been purchased, but until the addition of the wings of the Senate and House the art of the sculptor seems to have been forgotten.

With the addition of the extensions to the Capitol a new era dawned and a new appreciation was shown toward the art of the sculptor. America at this time had no sculptors of the first rank. Of course, we claim Powers, Crawford, Rogers, and others as American artists, but they received their art education in Italy. Their thoughts were Italian; their art expressions were in terms of Italian art; they were loyal to the United States but their ideals were those of Italy. Powers tried to escape, but his examples were only the exact copies of nature expressed with the dexterity and skill of the Italian carver of figures.

With the progress of the erection of the Senate and House wings Italian sculptors came to Washington in large numbers; some were employed in decorative sculpture—this and the carving of the capitals of the columns of which there were many in the different portions of the Capitol. The marble balustrade afforded employment for other carvers, while the pediment of the Senate wing, with its sculptural decorations designed by Crawford, gave work to the best of these foreign artists. Employed on the figures of the sculpture of the Senate pediment were Guido Butti, Tommaso Gagliardi, Francis Vincenti, and Casoni, whose names appear on the pay rolls and vouchers of the late fifties.

It is to Tommaso Gagliardi that we are indebted for the bust of Thomas Crawford in the north corridor gallery floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol. Gagliardi is described by one of the apprentices as the most famous carver of all. His life was a romance embracing in his wanderings many countries. He was associated with Larkin G. Mead in the construction of the Lincoln Monument at Springfield, Ill. Butti was described as the most versatile of all, being an excellent designer and modeler as well as a sculptor of distinction. His work on the archway of the entrance on Eighth Street to the Post Office Building is a work of a high order. The original models are in the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in Philadelphia. Vincenti is the author of the two busts of Indians, Besheek-ke and Ayshe-bah-ke-koshay in the east corridor of the gallery floor of the Senate wing. In this same

corridor is the bust of Garibaldi, by Giuseppe Martegana, presented to the Senate by the Italian Society of Washington, at a time when Doctor Verdi was prominent in the affairs of the society. Martegana was not employed at the Capitol and information concerning him has not been found.

While the works executed by the artists named may not seem to have as high a degree of merit as that possessed by the first Italians engaged upon the art works of the Capitol, the artistic balance was regained in the middle fifties with the advent of Constantino Brumidi whose connection with the mural decorations of the Capitol lasted for nearly a quarter of a century. Brumidi and his work may seem more closely related to the art life of Washington for the reason that having been in political disfavor in Rome, intercession was made for his release as a political prisoner coupled with the permission to leave Italy for the United States. This concession was granted through the influence of Monsignor John Norris at that time attached to the Vatican, and who accompanied Brumidi to New York and thence to Washington. Brumidi painted portraits for members of the Norris family in New York, and for members of the Joyce family in Washington, and commenced his work in the Capitol by the decoration of a committee room then occupied by the House Committee on Agriculture, and now by one of the subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations. It is to be regretted that this first example of the work of Brumidi, and as claimed by Brumidi, the first example of "real fresco" in the United States, should occupy a room where but few can examine it and where it is never seen by the general public.

Another example of the work in fresco by Brumidi is to be found in the southwest corner on the wall of the House of Representatives, and with this reference a few words of explanation are needed. At the time of the first occupancy of the present Hall of the House of Representatives, the construction of the wings of the Capitol Building were under the charge of the Secretary of War, who appointed as superintendent of construction Capt. Montgomery C. Meigs, an engineer officer, a West Pointer, by no means deficient in self-esteem, and a man who did his own thinking and formed his own conclusions. Captain Meigs sometimes wisely and sometimes unwisely formulated plans for both the interior and the exterior decorations of the Capitol. One of his ideas was that the side walls of the Hall of the House of Representatives should be decorated by paintings of a historic character, so that the legislators might be confronted with historic paintings illustrating important events in the history of the United States, and with this end in view encouraged Brumidi to paint upon a panel in the southwest corner of the Hall a picture entitled: "Corwallis sues for a cessation of hostilities under a flag of truce," and then as a touch of defiance to the Know-Nothing Party with their slogan, "America for Americans," signed this work "C. Brumidi, American citizen."

The new Hall of the House of Representatives was first occupied as a legislative chamber on December 16, 1857. On December 14 Captain Meigs received an anonymous letter informing him that a party was organizing to secure his removal from the position of Superintendent of the Capitol Building and that the painting on the wall was universally condemned, the subject is considered inappropriate, and the execution execrable, in view of all of which he recommends that the painting be wiped out.

Among other qualities of a commendable character, Captain Meigs possessed all of the qualifications of a high-grade office man. In his management there were no "scraps of paper" to be destroyed and his conscience would not permit him to consign to the waste basket an unfriendly criticism. Patient and long suffering, he considered such events as a part of the duties of his office, and carefully folding the letter in suitable size for filing, he wrote on the outer fold as follows:

"One of many indications. The picture is as good as could be painted in six weeks. It shows what the effect of painting on the panels will be, and that is all I intended. It cost little, and I have not the least objection of a better picture being by Congress put over it, but it was the best that could be done at the time, and I had no more time at my disposal."

"M. C. M."

While Congress has not seemed favorably disposed to having the remaining panels filled with paintings, this example of the work of Brumidi has remained in place for nearly three-quarters of a century and the challenge to subsequent mural decorators to excel this work still remains without acceptance.

Within the past two years the art curator was called upon by a painter of distinction, one whose name is well known, but it may be better not to divulge the name of one who was not speaking for publication. This painter expressed himself as being favorably impressed with this mural decoration by Brumidi, and after being told all of the circumstances under which it was painted on the wall, and the adverse criticism of the anonymous critic in 1857, smilingly replied:

"I am a painter by profession; I have studied frescoes carefully for many years, and as a result of my knowledge on the subject I willingly state that this is the best example of fresco painting I have found in the United States."

But the reputation of Brumidi does not rest upon this example of his work. His most ambitious composition is his Apotheosis of Washington, painted in the canopy of the rotunda, sometimes spoken of as the eye of the dome. In this work he has idealized Washington to the dignity of a mythological personage and has surrounded him with adoring groups, symbolizing the thirteen original States. It may be a step too far toward the mythology of other ages, but the daring conception and the knowledge to paint groups for observation at a great distance shows his ability to judge of effects as seen from the floor of the rotunda. Other important work included the decoration of the room now occupied as a committee room by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in which the lunettes are decorated with scenes illustrating important events in the Revolutionary War.

In these paintings he has touched a high mark in the excellency of mural decorations of his period, or for that matter, any period. His compositions are full of the spirit of action and his coloring strong and marked with a refinement that emphasizes the artist who works for the joy of creating something of lasting beauty rather than for the purpose of the transformation of his efforts into a matter of pecuniary recompense. The office of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the committee room of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia were also decorated by Brumidi, but his greatest triumph of his art as a mural painter may be found in the President's room in the Senate wing of the Capitol. In this room on the side walls are creditable portraits of the members of the first Cabinet of President Washington, and in the ceiling may be found portraits of Columbus, Vesputius, Franklin, and Brewster, and in ceiling circles of good size are groups of which religion and liberty seem to be the most attractive. The side walls are also decorated with narrow panels of floral design interspersed with a multitude of small independent decorations, some related, others holding their place by that rare charm of beauty which in itself furnishes an ample excuse for its place in the decorative scheme of this wonderful room.

Following Brumidi, the tide of preference swings again to the art of the sculptor as a representation of the part Italy has had in the continuance of the art work of the Capitol. In this connection the most conspicuous instance is the work of Gaetano Trentanove, the sculptor of the statue of Marquette, the French explorer who valiantly carried the cross through his period of discovery in the Middle West section of this country long years before the birth of the United States, and whose early life period is only exceeded by that of the representative from Massachusetts, Winthrop, and Williams of Rhode Island, both of whom were born prior to the year 1600.

Dante Sodini, one of the later Italian sculptors, is represented in Statuary Hall by the statue of J. M. L. Curry, diplomat, soldier, and statesman. Sodini, as well as Trentanove, are residents of Florence, Italy, the city of which Antonio Cappelano, one of the sculptors of the period marked by the work in the rotunda, also claimed as his home.

The last of the trio of modern Italian sculptors to find a place for his work in Statuary Hall, where are now assembled 58 statues, is Pompeo Coppini, who claims Moglia in the Province of Mantua, as his birthplace. He was, however, educated in the Academy of Fine Arts in Florence, and executed many important commissions in portrait sculpture previous to coming to the United States. Mr. Coppini should know something of our Capital City, as he was an assistant to the sculptor Hinton Perry in the Neptune Fountain fronting the Library of Congress.

In this somewhat hurried reference to the work of the Italian artists in the United States Capitol Building it is well to remember that while in point of numbers the work of other artists may outnumber that of the Italian artists, in point of influence and excellence the work of other artists have had an inspiring lesson in the contemplation of the work of these pioneers, who freely gave of themselves in the foundation work of the art impulses of the Capitol of this now great Republic, not that they loved the land of their birth less but because they loved to give of what was abundant in Italy to this new country so much in need of artistic inspiration.

One of the incidents of kindly interest shown by Italy in the United States occurred in 1865, when the Roman citizens sent to Abraham Lincoln a jagged, antique stone (from the Federal City, by S. D. Wyeth) containing a Latin inscription which freely translated is as follows: "To Abraham Lincoln, President for the second term of the United States, this stone from the wall of Servius Tullius has been sent by the Roman citizens in order that the memory of freedom's champion might be joined with that of the Roman citizens."

This stone reached the White House shortly after the assassination of President Lincoln, and was ordered to be placed in the Capitol, where it remained in the crypt until the act of July 14, 1870, transferred it to the possession of the Lincoln Memorial Association at Springfield, Ill., for the purpose of being placed in the monument then being erected to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

Servius Tullius was the sixth King of Rome and reigned 44 years, from 578 to 534 B. C. He extended the boundaries of the city of Rome and surrounded it with a wall of defense. While his reign was not marked by any great military exploits, he showed a deep interest in

the welfare of the common people, whose rights he endeavored to secure by just law. The constitution of Servius Tullius was regarded by the Romans as the basis of their civil and political institutions, and the Plebeians especially regarded him as the great protector of their order.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the printing of supplemental report No. 3, Part II, on H. R. 6, a bill to amend the definition of oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on H. R. 6. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LOANS TO FARMERS

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of emergency seed, feed, fertilizer loans, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the storm-stricken areas of the Southern States are doing everything humanly possible to secure an additional authorization so the Secretary of Agriculture can make loans this year for the purchase of seed, fertilizers, feed, and so forth, the same as was done last year. Many farmers in my section and throughout the South paid up their loans last year even though they had little or no money left for the use of themselves and their families. They have had very heavy rains again, and many are in as much need of financial help as ever.

Some of those in control of this legislation are urging that there is only slight need for these loans and that only \$3,000,000 should be made available. This is not at all sufficient. At least \$6,000,000 should be made available, and I feel that much more could be used advantageously. In fact, I have introduced a bill to make available the sum of \$50,000,000 to be loaned for these purposes wherever and whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an emergency exists.

Day before yesterday before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation where the land settlement bill is being considered, and also on yesterday when these emergency loans were being discussed at a conference of Members and Senators in the Senate committee room on agriculture and forestry, I pointed out that last year the Government got \$43 out of the tobacco grown in the United States every time the farmer got \$28 out of the sale price of his tobacco. In other words, by reason of the various taxes on manufactured tobacco, the Government gets nearly twice as much as the farmer from a crop of tobacco. Then it is suggested that the farmer is asking too much from his Government.

The United States Department of Agriculture, upon request, reports that last year the farmers of the United States received for the entire crop of tobacco the sum of \$285,583,000 in round numbers and that the United States Government received from the same crop in taxes on cigars, cigarettes, chewing tobacco, and so forth, the grand total of \$434,444,543.

In asking for a loan of \$6,000,000 the farmers are in effect saying to their Government, "We want to borrow back only \$1 out of every \$72 that you made out of our last year's crop. We are not asking for a gift, but only for a loan of this small amount to help the Government make again this year more by nearly twice out of the farmer crop of tobacco than the farmer gets himself for all his labor and expenses." Then the Government—Oh, the shame of it—says to these farmers, "No, the Government can not afford to loan you \$1 out of every \$72 that we received out of your tobacco crop, but we may grudgingly loan you \$1 out of every \$144 that we received out of your tobacco crop last year."

This same Government says that it is helping the farmer solve his problems, and yet by the Federal farm loan system it is selling the farmers land and turning him and his family out because he can not pay his interest, when the Government is getting nearly twice as much as the farmer gets out of his crop of tobacco. Then, again, it must be remembered that the amount that the farmer gets is gross and not net. Ofttimes the farmer does not get actual expenses. So it is that the Government gets anywhere from one to a thousand times as much as the farmer gets net out of the farmer's crop.

Much is said about the wonderful farm relief bill which was passed last spring to create a fund of \$500,000,000 to loan to the farmers, and yet the Government got out of the farmer's tobacco crop last year nearly as much as was authorized in the farm loan act. This money, provided in the farm loan act, is not donated to the farmer but is to be loaned to him, and is to be repaid with interest.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the purpose of the so-called farm relief act of last year is to stabilize prices. The

thing that I have always feared, and now fear, is that the prices of tobacco and cotton will be stabilized so low, until the average price will be below the average price without the law.

I have heard several men argue at great length that the farm relief act is a wonderful piece of legislation. There is no use arguing this to the farmers of the Nation. The price he receives for his farm products will be all the argument he will care for. No amount of statistics will convince him that a low and unfair price for his cotton is farm relief. You can not convince the farmer that the Farm Board is doing wonders for him when his tobacco is selling for less than it costs to produce it and the Government is getting twice as much as he gets out of his tobacco. The farmer will know whether the farm act helps him or not, and no one need try to tell him.

Ordinarily, I do not quote statistics, because they are so dry; but I wish to quote just another item. In the year 1919 the farmers got out of their entire tobacco crop the sum of \$570,858,000, and the Government received in taxes only \$206,003,002. In other words, 11 years ago the farmer got nearly three times as much as the Government out of the tobacco crop, and last year the situation was changed and the Government got nearly twice as much as the farmer out of the entire tobacco crop.

I thought it might not be amiss to say this much in a humble effort to show that the Government can well afford to make the small emergency loans now desired by these very farmers out of whose labor the Government is making so much.

Frankly, is any headway being made with farm relief legislation? Eleven years ago out of every four dollars received by the farmer and the Government the farmer got three and the Government only one; now the Government gets about two and a half every time the farmer gets less than a dollar and a half.

This leaves out the consideration of the enormous and unconscionable profits of middlemen and the manufacturers of cigarettes, and so forth. But I shall not pursue the subject further at this time. I only wanted to submit this additional plea for the farmers of the Nation, and especially for those of the Southeastern States in the storm-stricken and flooded sections.

CALIFORNIA AND THE DIRIGIBLE BASE

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy in relation to the location of a dirigible base with a report that has been authorized to be printed this morning, with certain comments thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy relative to the location of a dirigible base, with certain comments relative to the same. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to me to print as a part of a special report some information concerning the proposed location of a dirigible base in California by the House of Representatives, I have been advised by the parliamentarian that such permission can not be granted by unanimous consent for the reason there is an existing law which gives to the Joint Committee on Printing the privilege of regulating matters of this kind. Therefore, I am submitting gracefully to the decision rendered.

I shall at a later date attempt to prove conclusively that the location of a dirigible base close to the shore of the Pacific Ocean would be an unwise policy for the reason it would be the first object of attack in case of war, and that the conditions from the standpoint of fogs, air currents, and changes in temperature would be similar to that which now exists at Lakehurst, which make such a location very undesirable.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 138

Resolved, That ROBERT R. BUTLER, of Oregon, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee on Pensions.

The resolution was agreed to.

WILLIAM M'KINLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCLINTOCK] is recognized for 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLINTOCK of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, 87 years ago to-day in the little town of Niles, Ohio, in a building which served the double purpose of

a residence and a country store, was born that great American, William McKinley. [Applause.]

After attending the public schools of his community, and after serving as a soldier for his country, he returned to his home community and entered the academy at Poland and later studied law. At the age of 24 years he came to my home city of Canton, Ohio, after being admitted to the bar to practice law in Ohio, to engage in the general practice of the law.

The first lawsuit he tried was tried in the village of Navarre in a barn. Pitted against him was the most eminent lawyer of Stark County, William A. Lynch. William McKinley won his first lawsuit. The first political speech he made was made in the city of Alliance, in a blacksmith's shop. His entire speech was devoted to the principle of protective tariff.

After being in Canton three years, the Republican Party was looking for some man to run for the office of prosecuting attorney. Stark County at that time was Democratic and the honor was an empty one. William McKinley finally acceded to the wishes of the members of his party and accepted the nomination as prosecuting attorney on the Republican ticket. He made a thorough canvass of his county and was elected by a majority of 102 votes. This was the beginning of the political career of this great statesman.

In 1876 he was first elected a Member of Congress. He served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 14 years and served as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when that famous tariff bill which bears his name was enacted into law.

William McKinley was a man of convictions. On the floor of this House, after his defeat in 1890, when he was defeated by the small margin of 302 votes, a free-trade measure was being considered. William McKinley arose and said:

On behalf of the people of my district, my State, and my Nation, I shall object to this measure.

A gentleman from another State remarked to him:

The people of your district did not speak very largely for you in the last election.

With a flash in his eye and without any show of anger he replied:

I do not measure my service to my constituents by the majority or by the vote that I get. I have convictions upon this subject which I would not surrender or refrain from advocating if 10,000 majority were cast against me. I consider service to my constituency whenever I advocate principles concerning which I have strong conviction.

[Applause.]

It would seem to me the words of William McKinley uttered in this House could be a motto for all of us.

He was defeated for Congress in 1890, but in 1891 he was elected Governor of Ohio, and in the year 1893 was reelected Governor of Ohio by an unprecedented majority.

I could relate many incidents of interest concerning this great man, but my time is limited.

The speech he made on September 5, 1901, the last that he gave to the American people and the people of the world, was a masterpiece. It will be remembered that he said in that speech:

God and mankind have linked the nations of the earth together. Let us remember our interest is in concord and not in conflict, and that our real eminence lies in the victories of peace and not those of war.

What a fine message this would be for the men who are now assembled in the great Naval Limitation of Armament Conference at London.

Yes; William McKinley was a devout Christian and an ideal citizen. Not only was he honored and respected in the city of Canton, but he was honored and respected by the people of this country.

He was married to a lady by the name of Ida Saxton. They became acquainted as they attended church. She was a teacher in the Presbyterian Sunday School. He was a regular attendant at the Methodist Church. On Sundays, as they wended their way to church services, they would meet and converse. These meetings developed into a companionship which, finally, resulted in marriage. To this marriage were born two children, one dying in infancy and the other in tender years.

The life of William McKinley had much misfortune in it, but he always, with a smile, braved the battle of life.

At the city of Canton, Ohio, has been erected a great monument in honor of his memory and his achievements. Thousands of people each year, not only from this country but from all the nations of the world, visit this monument. Recently, near it has been placed the house which he called his home when he was President of the United States.

Yes; the example that William McKinley has given us as a man, husband, and citizen is of the highest ideal. William McKinley was an outstanding and great soldier, lawyer, and Member of Congress. Yes, he was great as a governor and a President, but the greatest of all was William McKinley, the man. [Applause.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and other special orders, I may address the House for 60 minutes on the subject of prohibition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that on Friday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, at the close of other special orders, he may address the House for a period of 60 minutes on the subject of prohibition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

Mr. CRAMTON rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CRAMTON. To make a request for unanimous consent. There appears in the RECORD of to-day a minority report upon the proposed Potomac parkway by Major General Jadwin, former Chief of Engineers and former chairman of the National Park and Planning Commission. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to that legislation, and to include therein the majority report of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the same matter, and also a letter to me from Colonel Grant, and perhaps other matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the proposed creation of the George Washington memorial parkway and its relation to possible future power or navigation development in the Great Falls to Washington region of the Potomac, in the RECORD of January 28 appears the minority statement of General Jadwin, former Chief of Engineers, War Department, and former ex-officio member of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; also, a statement from the executive committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The statement of the executive committee is based upon an entire misunderstanding of the terms and purposes of H. R. 26, which proposes creation of the George Washington memorial parkway. It also misunderstands and therefore inaccurately states the attitude of the majority of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission who indorse the bill as reported to the House.

To clear this misunderstanding I give here the statement of August 2, 1929, sent to the Federal Power Commission by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Please note especially the resolution set forth therein, adopted by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission December 15, 1928, before this discussion became at all acute. Members will note that resolution declares that the commission favors the immediate acquisition of the lands for park purposes:

Leaving it open for Congress at any future time to authorize the development of the navigation, flood control, and power potentialities of the area should such development become of greater importance and be justified in the public interest.

It seems to me no statement could be clearer or fairer as to the policy and terms of H. R. 26.

The statement follows:

AUGUST 2, 1929.

Mr. F. E. BONNER,

Executive Secretary Federal Power Commission,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with Public Resolution No. 67, approved May 29, 1928, passed at the first session of the Seventieth Congress, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has studied the problem of the best use of the Potomac River Valley above Washington, with a view to preparing with the Federal Power Commission the "joint or separate reports" called for in that resolution. The study of the commission has included the preparation and analysis of the accompanying reports and documents which are submitted herewith for the information of the Federal Power Commission.

After extended consideration of the report on "The development of the Potomac River Valley for park and power purposes" by a joint committee of the Federal Power Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, together with supplementary infor-

NOVEMBER 12, 1928.

mation supplied at the request of the commission by Maj. Brehon Somervell, United States engineer officer, Washington, D. C., and after an intensive study on the ground by its committee on parks and other members, and extended discussion in formal session, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the following resolution on December 15, 1928:

"Resolved, That the National Capital Park and Planning Commission favors the acquisition of the Potomac Valley from Chain Bridge to and including Great Falls, and the development of this area for park purposes as funds may be made available, leaving it open for Congress at any future time to authorize the development of the navigation, flood-control, and power potentialities of the area should such development become of greater importance and be justified in the public interest."

The main considerations moving the commission to the above action were as follows:

1. The valley of the Potomac River from Chain Bridge, to and including Great Falls, has, in its natural condition, unique and distinctive scenic and recreational values accompanied by certain historic and scientific points of interest, which, as a whole, make it extraordinarily important to the Capital of the United States. These values are unique and distinctive in the sense that this is probably the best example in the Atlantic seaboard States of the particular type of natural scenery here presented, and that these natural scenic values are believed to be unexcelled by those in the vicinity of any national capital in the world. These values have not been fully appreciated and enjoyed by the public, mainly because the land is largely in private ownership and but little of the area is readily accessible.

2. Notwithstanding the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and painstaking care applied to the search for a method of conserving as much as possible of these values while developing an economically sound power project, all such methods which have yet been devised and all methods which seem likely to be possible involve the sacrifice of the major part of these great though intangible scenic, recreational, and inspirational values, although they do so in considerably varying degrees.

3. In other words, the two objectives of economically developing power on a large scale from the Potomac River, and of conserving the peculiar and characteristic scenic, recreational, and inspirational values of this part of the Potomac River Valley are so essentially in conflict that they can not both be attained in a satisfactory degree. Therefore the only basis for avoiding an inefficient and illogical compromise is to determine which of these two objectives should be the controlling or dominant purpose, and then to seek, as a by-product, so much and only so much of the other objective as is consistent with the fully successful attainment of the objective selected as the dominant one.

4. The "combination park and power schemes" presented by the joint committee represent, essentially, attempts to arrive at a thoroughly successful economic development of the potential water power of the Potomac River in such a way as would permit the incidental creation of as good a park on the margins of that development as is consistent with the controlling purpose of power production. They tend to indicate that if power development is to be the controlling objective, a park could be created, even so, that would probably be well worth the cost which its creation would add to that of a power project designed wholly without regard to park values. But it would be a totally different kind of park from the natural valley. And the price of creating this different and less valuable kind of park would not merely be a matter of dollars, and of the lapse of many years for the healing of scars, but would include the destruction for all time of essential characteristics which make the present natural river valley unique and distinctive as an appanage of the National Capital.

5. For such amount of power as would be used here, it does not appear that the prospective economic advantage to the National Capital and its environs from any expectable saving in cost of power from this source as compared with others, even assuming that the saving would be passed on to the consumers, would be so great, or that the people of this region and of the United States are so poor that they can not afford to forego it for the sake of retaining a unique feature of the National Capital.

6. It would therefore seem inadvisable to decide now upon the destruction for all time of the scenic and recreational and inspirational assets of such large prospective importance as those included in the valley of the Potomac at the doors of the National Capital.

(The foregoing expresses the views of the following members of the commission: Col. W. B. Ladue, Maj. R. Y. Stuart, Hon. Frederick N. Zihlman, Mr. Frederic A. Delano, Mr. Milton B. Medary, jr., Mr. Frederick L. Olmstead, Mr. J. C. Nichols, and Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant, 3d.)

General Jadwin did not concur in the above action and views of the commission as set forth in the RECORD of yesterday.

Also note the Park Committee report of an earlier date, and particularly in paragraph 7 that the question of power development is expressly left open for Congress to pass upon as conditions develop in the future:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PARKS

Subject: Potomac power project.

Members: Mr. Frederic A. Delano, Mr. Frederick Law Olmstead, Mr. Horace M. Albright, Maj. R. Y. Stuart, Col. William B. Ladue, Mr. J. C. Nichols, and Col. U. S. Grant, 3d.

After extended consideration of the report on "the development of the Potomac River Valley for park and power purposes" by a joint committee of the Federal Power Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, together with supplementary information supplied at the request of the commission by Maj. Brehon Somervell, United States Engineer officer, Washington, D. C., and after an intensive study on the ground, it is the opinion of the members of the committee on parks:

1. That the Gorge and Great Falls of the Potomac River have unique and distinctive scenic, historic, and scientific attractions affording in their present natural condition park values unexcelled by those in the environs of any national capital, values which are not now fully appreciated and enjoyed because the land is largely in private ownership and but little of the area is readily accessible.

2. That the adoption of any of the proposals contained in the joint committee's report, above referred to, for the development of water power within this area or of any plan for water-power development known or suggested to the commission will entail in greater or less degree destruction of these National Capital park values and their impairment by the introduction of incongruous structures and power lines.

3. That the dedication of this area for park purposes by the Nation is in the interest and for the enjoyment of all citizens of the United States, to whom the National Capital is a proud heritage.

4. That the use of this area for power purposes is largely of local and regional interest and benefit, and that the power to be developed therefrom is neither urgently required nor the only power obtainable at reasonable cost to meet the demand.

5. Moreover, that the nearness of this beautiful valley, with its pallsades and waterfall and other picturesque and historical attributes, to the Nation's Capital, together with the undeniable fact that this project does not stand high as an efficient source of power, appear to be strong arguments for not granting a permit for a development of this project at this time.

6. That in short your committee believes the national interest in the park and scenic values should not now be sacrificed for all time to the possible local commercial interest in a power development, because we do not believe that the people of the United States are so impoverished economically that they can not afford to retain in its full value this great scenic asset of the National Capital.

7. And, finally, that your committee, for the foregoing reasons and those set forth in greater detail in the accompanying comments on the joint report, recommends urging upon Congress the acquisition of the area indicated in accordance with S. 1280, and its development for park purposes as funds may be made available, leaving it open for Congress at any future time to authorize the development of the water-power potentialities of the site should such development become of greater public importance than the proposed park shall have been found to have.

FREDERICK LAW OLTMSTED,
Chairman.

Let me further reenforce what I have said before as to the national desire in this by quoting the following editorial expressions from the New York Times of January 28:

SAVING THE GORGE OF THE POTOMAC

In a letter to the editor of the Times published on this page yesterday the president of the American Society of Landscape Architects made an eloquent appeal for the preservation of the natural beauties of the gorge of the Potomac. Legislation sponsored by Representative CRAMTON, which will have the effect of protecting at least part of this area, will come up in Congress this week.

Here, at the very gateway to the Capital, is a wonderful bit of scenery. The broad waters of the river fall in a magnificent cataract over Great Falls and flow through a deep and narrow cleft to the calmer waters within the District of Columbia. Very few cities have anything to compare with this stretch of river and canal.

Naturally the power interests would like to get their hands on it, but it should be dedicated first to the scenic and recreational advantages which it richly affords.

Also, from the Louisville Times of January 25:

WILL THE POWER LOBBY WIN?

Rifling the environs of the National Capital of a great scenic asset is not beyond the plans of the ruthless exponents of "development," to whom all water which runs downhill is a lure.

When Lord Elgin looted the Parthenon, he did it at least to convey the Elgin marbles, now protected, as a public exhibition, to a seat of higher civilization when, with Greece under the rule of Turkey, they might have become the prize of some other spoilsman with worse results.

Representative CRAMTON, of Michigan, will try next week to procure favorable action in the House of Representatives upon his bill for Treasury advances to purchase inner and outer parks for Washington City.

They would include Great Falls of the Potomac, within 15 miles of the White House, threatened by a power project. The power lobby is said to be very active against the bill.

Great Falls would be worth millions to Washington, of course; but that is not all. The Nation's Capital belongs to the Nation. Every American has a right to feel a proprietor's interest in its improvement and in protection of scenic areas in its vicinity which should add to its beauty.

The sacrifice of Great Falls by Congress to a power project would warrant a paraphrase of Lord Byron's inscription upon the Parthenon, in caustic criticism of Lord Elgin's achievement: "Quod non facerunt Gothi, hoc facerunt Scoti."

Power lobbyists seemingly father and further the happy idea that it can be represented that preserving Great Falls would or might interfere with waterway connection from the Ohio to the Potomac.

The American Civic Association—student of the problem, able, thorough, disinterested—says the proposed reservation and acquirement of the banks of the Potomac from Mount Vernon to Great Falls would not interfere with navigation plans, and that delay may cost the National Capital an immensely valuable park.

Also the following resolutions of the American Civic Association and letter of the American Engineering Council:

The executive board of the American Civic Association, representing the expressed sentiment of its 75 committees on the Federal City in all parts of the United States, and the widespread interest of its members and citizens at large throughout the country, renews its support of the Cramton bill (H. R. 26) to provide for the prompt purchase of the inner and outer park systems of the Federal City, as projected by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and particularly desires to see the river banks of the Potomac from historic Mount Vernon to picturesque Great Falls preserved in a scenic park which it is believed will command world-wide attention and play an important part in providing a uniquely beautiful landscape setting worthy of the handsome public buildings and monuments of the National Capital.

AMERICAN ENGINEERING COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1930.

HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CRAMTON: I have read with much interest your address of yesterday before the House of Representatives concerning H. R. 26. You will perhaps recall that at the luncheon of the American Society of Landscape Architects I said the Nation was indebted to you for the efforts you had made to preserve the natural beauties of Washington and its environs. I further stated that American Engineering Council was in full sympathy with your bill, but held that flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric development could be realized without in any way destroying the scenic beauties of the Potomac Valley; and also if there were any real conflicts we would agree that scenic beauty should take priority. Hence there is little, if any, difference of opinion between you and the council.

However, there are many who hold the honest and unselfish opinion that H. R. 26 as now drafted would greatly limit, if not prohibit, the development of navigation and power on the Potomac River. For the sake of clarity, therefore, it seems to us that the amendment proposed by Mr. DEMPSEY is a very desirable one. It would erase the slight reservation the council entertains with respect to the bill, and this would undoubtedly be true of others. We hope you will accept the amendment, because we believe it will strengthen your position in many directions and hasten the passage of the bill.

We have written to Mr. DEMPSEY expressing our very keen interest in your bill and stating that we hope the amendment proposed will prevail in order that we, as well as others, may wholeheartedly support you in this worthy enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. WALLACE,
Executive Secretary.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8960) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MAPES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee adjourned yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin had reserved a point of order against the paragraph. What is the pleasure of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. STAFFORD. From information which I have received I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Pennsylvania say to the point of order?

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, it is undoubtedly subject to a point of order.

Mr. GARNER. I do not think the item ought to be in the bill even if it was authorized by law, so I see no reason for delaying the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The item is not only not authorized by law, but in exact opposition to existing law. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Steamboat inspectors: For 11 supervising inspectors; inspectors of hulls and inspectors of boilers; assistant inspectors, as authorized by law, for the following ports: New York, 43; Pittsburgh, 2; New Orleans, 10; Baltimore, 10; Providence, 4; Boston, 10; Philadelphia, 12; San Francisco, 18; Buffalo, 8; Cleveland, 8; Milwaukee, 4; Chicago, 6; Grand Haven, 2; Detroit, 4; Norfolk, 8; Seattle, 14; Portland (Oreg.), 6; Albany, 2; Portland (Me.), 4; Los Angeles, 6; Galveston, 4; Mobile, 4; Savannah, 2; Toledo, 2; and 6 traveling inspectors; in all, \$972,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last figure. I think it would be illuminating for the House and the country to have the chairman of the committee explain the occasion for the increased number of inspectors in the Steamboat Inspection Service as provided in the bill. I notice that there has been a considerable increase, a deserved increase; the appropriation covers increase of salaries for some inspectors. There has been criticism of the service throughout the country—that they have failed in the performance of their duty in inspecting hulls and engines.

Take the incident of the *Vestris*, a lamentable situation, especially in the face of the disclosures that were brought out in the investigation by the British authorities. In the investigation our inspectors glossed over inquiring into essential facts at the investigation and we had to go to Great Britain for the real information as to the real facts that caused the disaster.

We had some disasters on the Great Lakes last year which cost the lives of some fine sailors, where the ferryboat *Milwaukee* sunk in mid-lake and the steamer *Wisconsin* foundered—in terrible storms, it is true. The latter, after it had weathered a severe storm came into the port of Milwaukee listing and a few days after encountered another storm, in which it sunk, costing the lives of members of its crew. It is the impression in Milwaukee that after the vessel came into the port listing, in a disabled condition, she should not have been permitted to go on another trip until she had been thoroughly inspected—that she was in no condition to weather a severe storm.

I think the committee is attempting to meet, in part, that situation by providing additional inspectors. I do not know whether any more are detailed on the Great Lakes, on Lake Michigan, than are provided by law, but there has been something wrong with this inspector service in not properly inspecting the vessels under its jurisdiction. At the time of the *Eastland* disaster, when that vessel turned turtle when moored to its dock in the Chicago River, I happened to be there the day after and saw them bringing the bodies out of the hold of the overturned excursion steamer. The department attempted to gloss over the responsibility for that disaster, saying that it was not the fault of the inspectors, when it was absolutely their fault in failing to perform the duty that the people of the country expect them to do. I yield now for some explanation as to whether the committee has sought to correct that situation by providing additional inspectors for this service.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, living on the Great Lakes as I do, I am quite familiar with the condition of affairs just stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin and to the committee that the very thing we are trying to provide in the service is more steamboat inspectors. The department is not just bound to send so many inspectors to Milwaukee if more are needed. We have provided this year for an additional 45 inspectors and assistant inspectors. The reason for that is to make more thorough the annual inspections and to keep up reinspections. There is where the great trouble was in the case the gentleman mentioned. If there had been a reinspection of that vessel when it came into port, listed as it was, it never would have gone out; and it is to provide for those very conditions that we are taking

this action. The committee is in full accord with the Secretary of Commerce. We want to provide these additional facilities, because we realize the great importance of the matter and we realize the many lives that have been lost by reason of lack of examination. We have gone as far as we could with the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget, and if we have not provided sufficient funds, I say to the gentleman that another year we will go still further.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand the gentleman, the committee has granted the full request of the department for additional help?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad, indeed. Of course, we all agree that human supervision does not prevent disasters to vessels caught in heavy storms or venturing out in stress of storm and taking the risk. Nevertheless, if further disasters occur on the Great Lakes, inasmuch as the committee has provided sufficient inspectors to provide reasonable inspection of hulls and boilers in this bill, we will know that the bureau will not have any alibi in case they are at fault. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing overcrowding of passenger vessels: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to employ, temporarily, such persons as may be necessary, of whom not more than two at any one time may be employed in the District of Columbia, to enforce the laws to prevent overcrowding of passenger and excursion vessels, and all expenses in connection therewith, \$18,840.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is anent the same inquiry that I submitted a moment ago as to the adequacy of the inspection service for passenger vessels, especially during the excursion season. It was my privilege during the past summer to ride on some of these passenger vessels leaving the port of Detroit for down-the-river resorts, to Bois Blanc Island, at the mouth of the river, or on to Put in Bay. On Sundays, when I made those trips, I have seen passengers crowded to far beyond what I thought was the number allowed under the regulations. I think there were not adequate life-saving devices on board those vessels for one-half the number of passengers. If any sudden squall had happened on Lake Erie—and Lake Erie, by reason of its shallow waters, is subject to severe squalls—I hesitate to think what direful catastrophe might have happened if the passengers on one of those crowded vessels had become panic-stricken and gone to one side and caused the boat to list too much. Further, I saw coming into Put in Bay on that Sunday an old hulk, as I would term it, a side-wheeler, similar to those I saw many years ago on the Delaware River, 40 or more years ago, coming from Sandusky, unfit, as I thought, from a casual observation, for lake service except in calm weather.

In connection with these direful catastrophes on the Great Lakes occasioned by the unusual storms of last fall I recall when one of the car ferries, laden down with heavily laden freight cars, went out in the face of one of the severest storms Lake Michigan had ever known, when many mariners thought it was suicidal to venture out from port. The vessel sank, and no one knows how it occurred, because no one lived to tell the tale. I think there should be some commission authorized by the Government to pass upon the serviceability of these steamers after they have been in the service 30 or 40 years, particularly those engaged in passenger traffic; if they are found after a thorough inspection to be waning in seaworthiness, then to be junked. We did that same thing years ago in connection with the railway post-office cars.

Twenty-five years ago it was called to the attention of the Post Office Committee that the railways of the country were using old wooden cars—to all appearances sound—coated over with a nice coat of paint, which, when you put the knife into them, proved to be of rotted wood. The life of the wood had disappeared, and they were nothing but tinder boxes in case of collision. At that time we passed a provision that would not permit such cars more than 30 years old to continue in that character of service. I well know that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. That is an axiom that has been confirmed by my years of service in this House. Yet it is only when these catastrophes occur that the country is aroused and that the attention of Congress is directed to some remedies so that these conditions may not occur again. I know that the Committee on Appropriations is not a legislative committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. All that the Appropriations Committee can do is to provide funds. I am asking now whether the hearings disclose anything as to the use of this appropriation of \$18,840 to prevent overcrowding on passenger vessels, which, I suppose, is largely utilized in connection with excursion steamers on the Great Lakes and on the rivers and sounds tributary to the ocean?

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, a very large portion of the money appropriated here is used on passenger service on the Great Lakes. Last year these inspectors examined 8,453 trips. Of course the gentleman knows that only a portion of that would be on the Great Lakes. It covers the whole United States. The ships usually take about a day or a day and a half or two days for a trip. A good lively port might have 30 or 40 ships in a day. When you figure up to 8,453 trips, it means that the service is universal all over the United States in the waters of the United States. Another thing, last year it is reported there were 170,000 people waiting to go aboard these ships.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do the hearings disclose what was the character of those ships from which they were turned back?

Mr. SHREVE. No. I think we have that in the report from the bureau. I do not think it is in the hearings. We give them the same amount that they have had for some time, \$18,840. It is a service, you know, where much of it is on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, covering week-end service. Frequently there is a crowd of young men anxiously waiting to act as inspector.

Mr. STAFFORD. All that I am concerned in is whether the appropriation is adequate to meet the needs, so that the inspection service can not throw the burden upon Congress in case of a mishap on the ground that they did not have sufficient funds to properly inspect the vessels.

Mr. SHREVE. I call the gentleman's attention to page 274 of the report of the Secretary of Commerce. I think he will find there an answer to all the questions he has raised.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has called the attention of the House to the matter of steamboat inspection. After the *Vestris* disaster the whole country was interested in the proper inspection of ocean-going and lake steamers. I have pending in the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries now three or four bills intended to bring our Steamboat Inspection Service up to date. I have pending also before the Committee on Rules a resolution seeking the appointment of a commission to study the navigation laws and the steamboat inspection code. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said, it is difficult to get any action looking toward the proper protection of life at sea or on the Great Lakes.

Why, Mr. Chairman, many Members who were on the floor when I made my statement in the last Congress concerning the *Vestris* could not believe that the law of the United States to-day as to the question of limited liability of the owners of seagoing vessels is a statute that was enacted in England away back in the reign of Henry VIII.

Mr. SHREVE. It is a good law.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; it is not a good law. It is a murderous law. Not only is the owner of the steamer limited in liability for damages to the value of the vessel, and therefore no liability exists if the entire vessel is lost, but by a decision of the Supreme Court, by a divided court, the insurance money is not applicable to pay losses incurred by reason of the negligence of the owners of vessels.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. May I not invite the attention of the committee to the fact that the Steamboat Inspection Service is required by law to pass only upon the blue prints of the boilers, but not as to the hulls, and nowhere is it provided that the stability shall be investigated?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes. The law does not provide for "stability" supervision in the course of the ship's construction. I am not complaining of the present Steamboat Inspection Serv-

ice but of the law; a law that was enacted in the early eighties, when hulls had but two air-tight compartments, and the marine architecture of those days was entirely different from what it is now. The Steamboat Inspection Service has no power or jurisdiction over the hull or the stability or the details of construction of vessels.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. But details with respect to the liability?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. We have sent delegates to the conference of London on the safety of lives at sea. I think the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE] was one of our delegates. A large proportion of those delegates were experts. They attended the conference. They are back now, but nothing has been done to write into law the experience or the findings of that conference in London.

I was told yesterday by Capt. Andrew Furuseth, the head of the seamen's union:

If you remove the limitation of liability law, we will be willing to waive all inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would not go that far, because I do believe inspection will always be necessary. But in this age when we have proper safeguards as to automobiles and liability insurance against every kind of accident, why should we still be governed by a law modeled after a statute enacted, as I say, under Henry VIII and limit liability of shipowners. As the gentleman from Wisconsin says, of course the Committee on Appropriations has no responsibility as to these laws.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I understood the gentleman from Maine to say that when the treaty, which is now pending in the Senate, is ratified by the London conference legislation will be initiated. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope legislation will be initiated. When we had the load law under consideration we could not pass that load bill unless we exempted coastwise vessels.

There is no reason why coastwise vessels should be exempt from the load line law; there is no reason in the world, but we had to pay that price in order to get a start on a proper load line law.

Mr. BACON. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman's position, and was merely explaining the delay.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I understand, and I thank the gentleman for bringing a ray of hope that we may get consideration before the Committee on the Merchant Marine for a rewriting of our entire shipping law in order to bring it up to date.

Gentlemen, the *Vestris* disaster could not have occurred had there been proper inspection. I charge that the stability on the *Vestris* was unsafe, was too low, and a test has proven that. The Steamboat Inspection Service took out the sister ship of the *Vestris*, a ship built from the same plans, and the test showed that the stability was too low and the vessel unsafe.

We must change the limitation liability law; we have got to change the steamboat inspection law in order to give proper jurisdiction to the Steamboat Inspection Service for the approval of plans with reference to hulls as well as boilers and machinery, and to regulate safety at sea to the same extent that we regulate safety on land, and bring the law up to the present day and not rely on antiquated and obsolete laws.

I am glad the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] brought the subject up, and it is gratifying to hear from the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] that he has information to the effect that the Committee on the Merchant Marine will give this matter consideration before long.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, the committee took this matter into consideration. We formerly had 259 inspectors and this year we have increased the number to 304. These inspectors are all very high-class men. They are selected entirely by civil service, from the civil-service list. They are men who are licensed officers and they have all had actual service as desk officers or engineer officers on some ship. These men are required to pass a civil-service examination, and when they have any vacancy they simply ask for the list of eligibles, and from that list they select the highest man. The bureau, as far as is possible under existing legislation, is rendering a very valuable service. I will agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] that there should be legislation covering this subject. But, of

course, this committee is simply an appropriating committee and has gone as far as it can in relieving the situation.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shipping commissioners: For salaries of shipping commissioners, \$44,800.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The section reads, "For shipping commissioners," and the appropriation proposed is \$44,800. It is the duty of these shipping commissioners, as I understand it, to attend to the booking or licensing of American seamen.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. This appropriation is for the payment of the salaries of shipping commissioners. These officers ship and discharge merchant seamen at the principal ports, turn over to the courts the wages due deceased or deserting seamen, and arbitrate disputes arising between crews and their officers or owners. The awards of the shipping commissioner are binding on both parties and by law are conclusive of the rights of the parties in judicial proceedings. This system of arbitration secures to seamen and other employees a full hearing and judgment on disputed matters in accordance with the facts and the law without expense or undue delay.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In addition to that, we have in New York, and I think in other ports, a shipping bureau of the Shipping Board. Can the gentleman tell how the shipping bureau of the Shipping Board conflicts with the duties of the commissioners?

Mr. SHREVE. Not at all. I know of no conflict.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There is a conflict there.

Mr. SHREVE. They are not given the same power that these commissioners have.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the function of the shipping bureau in acting for the Shipping Board?

Mr. SHREVE. Well, it is just purely a local act in looking after their own business and their own ships.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But we pay their wages.

Mr. SHREVE. We might pay them, but it is purely a local matter, while this takes in every seaman coming into port.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly; and that is just my point.

Mr. SHREVE. While the board the gentleman refers to is only operating its own lines.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But it is a United States office and is paid for by the Government.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The office of the United States Commissioner is an old institution and it has existed for many years. The so-called shipping bureau—we have one in New York and, I think, one in San Francisco—looks after the personnel of the Shipping Board. It is a sort of employment office. Now, the trouble is that American seamen are not getting proper treatment at the hands of the shipping bureau, or whatever it is called. We have constant and repeated complaints that American ship after American ship leave the port of New York with a large percentage of its personnel made up of aliens, when there are applications on file of American citizens who would like to get work on those boats. I have brought the matter to the attention of the House repeatedly, and I serve notice now that unless the shipping bureau in New York, in looking after the personnel of the Shipping Board, is not more zealous in giving preference to American citizens, that when the proper appropriation bill comes before the House the thing to do would be to abolish it entirely.

That is what ought to be done. I am not referring to the shipping commissioners but I am referring to this shipping bureau that is under the Shipping Board, and provided for in the independent offices appropriation bill.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Equipment: For apparatus, machinery, tools, and appliances used in connection with buildings or work of the bureau, typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, laboratory supplies, materials, and supplies used in the construction of apparatus, machinery, or other appliances, including their exchange; piping, wiring, and construction incident to the installation of apparatus, machinery, or appliances; furniture for laboratories and offices, cases for apparatus, \$163,000, including \$93,000 for repairs and necessary alterations to buildings, of which amount \$75,000 may be used for remodeling the north building, including contract architectural services.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this is as good a place as any to pass comment upon the activities, the growing activities, of the Bureau of Standards. No one on this floor will deny that the Bureau

of Standards has done and is doing exceptional work; but I rise more to criticize the tendency of that bureau to nose itself into activities which do not properly belong to it.

I understand that in the bill now under consideration the committee has granted all the requests made by the bureau with respect to new activities.

It is the proper work of the Bureau of Standards to determine the standard as to various materials used in manufacture, but when they go into a far-off, extraneous proposal to determine the standard of dress patterns, to inquire into the stature of women, especially in this modern age, so they can recommend to the manufacturers of dress patterns what should be the standardization of the modern dress for women, I think it is well we should pause for a minute, even in a facetious way, to direct attention to the extreme extent that this bureau is indulging in the establishment of standards.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. In a little while.

It was my happy privilege years ago to serve on the subcommittee on appropriations that determined the amount of appropriations for the Bureau of Standards when that eminent scientist, Doctor Stratton, was at its head. If there is one regret I have, in looking back over my service, it is that I did not use more stressful efforts to increase his salary as director from \$6,000 to a commensurate salary of \$10,000 or \$12,000. But high compliment should be paid him, that notwithstanding alluring proposals from private sources he remained at his post during the entire World War, giving valuable service to the Government in all war activities; and the Bureau of Standards was of great service during the war in that particular.

Doctor Stratton then accepted a call as president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which high position, in the highest institute of that character in the country, he now so capably and efficiently fills. I am quite certain if he had continued to be the head of this great bureau he would not have desecrated on this irrelevant standardization work of providing a standard for dress patterns.

I read on page 163 of the hearings:

Dress patterns: Commercial standard CS 13-30 for dress patterns is of wide interest to the women who do home sewing and the dry goods and department stores, since it establishes standard classification and corresponding body measurements used as a basis for size designation of commercial dress patterns used in the home.

Now, perhaps some Member here may take me to task and ask me what privilege it is for a bachelor to speak on this subject which is so directly related to dresses. Of course, I have been the head of a home for a good many years and know a little about it but not as much, I gainsay, as some of the older or younger Members of the House who have large families.

Then he goes on:

Former confusing references to age have been eliminated in favor of size numbers; for example, a dress pattern formerly designated as "misses' age 18" will now be sold as "misses' size 18" and will be based on the following body measurements: Bust, 36 inches; waist, 30 inches; hip, 39 inches.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I could go on and cite other irrelevant examinations that are being made by this great bureau which is of a scientific character; and I say, in all seriousness, they are debasing the high standard of this Bureau of Standards by making such investigation of these irrelevant matters.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have an examination into skid platforms. This, I wish to say in advance, does not provide for any skids to have Members of Congress eliminated from political life. If it did, we would perhaps exert urgent protest against any outside agency becoming active in this way. But it goes on to provide a standard for skid platforms used in conveying freightable matter.

I have had some little practical experience in the six years I have been out of this Chamber with business affairs, and I have had occasion to purchase some of these skid-platform purveyors. There is no necessity to have any such investigation made by the Bureau of Standards to set up a national standardization so far as skid platforms are concerned.

I could go on throughout the hearings with other similar examples.

We are all concerned with home financing, and yet this scientific bureau has very likely invaded the province of the

Department of Agriculture, overlapping their activities, by making an investigation as to home finances.

They have even gone into the question of city planning and zoning.

They are all interesting subjects of investigation, but I say in all seriousness, this scientific bureau should not engage itself in investigation of these little petty matters that pertain more to some other branch of the Government than to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. SHREVE. For the information of the House I want to say that these matters are outside of the committee—none of this money for the Bureau of Standards is appropriated for this purpose. A large number of scientific men are working out plans similar to those that have been mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. In reply to the gentleman in charge of the bill, who knows far better the scope of the bill than I do, I direct his attention to page 152 of the hearings as to what the Bureau of Standards accomplished during the years 1928 and 1929. I could cite many other instances, running from page 152 to page 166, where are listed the different things that I have called attention to in the work the bureau has been engaged in during the years 1928 and 1929.

Now, if the bureau wants to degrade itself, to detract from its scientific value to the industrial business of the country, let them continue to give consideration to these minor little matters.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my good friend from Wisconsin, who is certainly very active in connection with this bill and usually does fine, constructive work, has made a serious mistake in this matter, and, as we say, "gotten off on the wrong foot." He would not have needed to indicate to the House that he is a bachelor and not familiar with reference to dress patterns. I think that unfamiliarity is evident not only as to dress patterns but covers all the works of this splendid division. I have asked for a few minutes in order that I may present to you the value of standardization, and, I hope, set the gentleman right. When the gentleman is right he is very right, and when he is wrong nobody can be "wronger." [Laughter.] I think that has been well demonstrated by his attitude toward this very meritorious item in this bill.

In the first place, I have some intimate knowledge of the work of this division. I have the honor and the pleasure of personal acquaintance with the man who is actively engaged in the work to which the gentleman objects.

In the first place, may I quiet the fears of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, by assuring him that the Bureau of Standards does not take up the work of standardization in the first instance until the demand for such service comes from industry itself?

About two years ago this new division was established in the bureau in response to the general demand, and it is intended to serve the needs of both producers and consumers in developing and recording standards in various lines of industry as a basis for everyday trade. Furthermore, the service provided by the division of commercial standards is extended only upon written request in order that there may be no possibility of Government interference in business. That business is proceeding in a thoroughly logical manner in asking this service is very generally recognized. In many instances the intensive competition in the production and sale of many commodities and the consequent desire to produce greater volume has resulted in lower qualities, which in turn has acted as a boomerang on the industry itself and to that degree has weakened the standard of that commodity with the buying public. Specifications agreed upon by an entire industry as a basis for both production and marketing have served as a means of restoring the confidence of consumers in various commodities thus adversely affected.

It certainly is clear to me that it is very much in the public interest to see that waste is eliminated in the manufacture of articles widely produced, and from the consumer's standpoint it certainly seems a wise function of government to encourage every movement that will improve the quality of commodities generally used.

Right at this point it will be of much interest, I am sure, to detail something of the procedure that is followed by the Bureau of Standards in establishing a commercial standard for an individual product. As stated a moment ago, the Bureau of

Standards does not take up the matter until a request comes from the industry itself.

Following such a request from a representative group, preliminary meetings are held to select and prepare a specification satisfactory to that particular branch of the industry—producers, distributors, or consumers, as the case may be. After a specification has been selected or prepared as being satisfactory to the proponent group, a large number of copies are prepared and transmitted to all those directly concerned, including producers, distributors, and consumers, for comment and criticism, and accompanied by an invitation to a general conference to discuss the proposed commercial standard. Trade papers are also furnished copies of the proposed commercial standard for comment and criticism. Following the adjustments that naturally might come from such a general conference and final adoption by it of the commercial standard, it is sent out with the recommendation that it will be made the standard practice, and that the best efforts of the signer will be used in securing its general adoption. When a satisfactory majority of the producers, judged by their volume of production, have approved this specification, and there is no active opposition to it from any particular group, the specification is then published as a commercial standard.

The advantage to consumers of these commercial standards will be especially noted when it is remembered that under the merchandising practice of the present time standard articles constitute a very large part of retail trade. When consumers learn that a certain article bears the brand of a commercial-standard article, they are assured that it measures up to a certain quality that has been agreed upon not only by the producers of the particular article but also has been given most careful consideration by the Bureau of Standards itself. When they go to buy an article they have the pledge of the Government of the United States that it conforms to a certain grade agreed upon.

Here is an illustration, and I again regret that my good Wisconsin friend can not be expected to have much understanding or information about it.

He would be about as wide of the mark as he is in commenting on ladies' dress patterns, bachelor such as he is. Here is the direct information, and I want to present the exact language of the bureau on that particular point. I shall take wall paper as an illustration of the procedure in various lines. The bureau puts out a booklet entitled "Wall Paper, Commercial Standard, 16-29." That booklet has been recently released:

WALL PAPER

The printed booklet entitled "Wall Paper, Commercial Standard CS16-29," has recently been released. The booklet sets forth the minimum quality requirements for serviceable wall papers and establishes standard sizes and weights.

The requirement of color fastness, together with adequate tests for its determination, is one of the important features of the standard specification. Grounding, or coating, weight of stock for embossed papers, and the manner of printing are among other points covered.

When wall paper is made according to the commercial standard, manufacturers may so label their products. The Wallpaper Association of the United States of America has adopted a copyrighted label which members are to use on all papers conforming to the standard. The label, which will appear on the back of wall-paper samples, reads as follows:

"The manufacturer guarantees this wall paper guaranteed to meet requirements of United States commercial standard CS16-29, issued by United States Department of Commerce."

An abbreviated form of this guaranty may also appear on the selva of the paper. This label should soon become the guide post to the purchaser of wall paper, giving assurance of satisfactory service and providing a basis for reestablishing consumer confidence in this important decorative material.

Without going into more detail in this connection, I should like to have permission to extend my remarks by including references to other commercial articles that have attained the rank of a commercial standard, and I ask that permission at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, in closing my remarks may I just call attention again to the practical phase of it, which I think that is very well summarized in this statement?

VALUE OF PRODUCTS AFFECTED BY COMMERCIAL STANDARDS

Census reports are available for only a few of the industries which have adopted commercial standards, and the latest figures available were compiled before their adoption, but the figures are indicative of the magnitude of the industries now interested in the establishment of commercial standards.

Industrial and domestic fuel oils: The commercial standard covers fuel oils used for domestic heating and industrial heating and power generation. Value of production in 1927, \$357,631,083.

Stoddard solvent: This is a petroleum distillate used by dry cleaners. It is included under naphtha in the census report. Value of production in 1927, \$68,943,123.

Wall paper: Value of production in 1927, \$30,059,153.

Dress patterns: Value of production in 1927, \$13,782,356. Total for four industries, \$470,415,715.

SAVINGS EFFECTED THROUGH COMMERCIAL STANDARDS

Business savings from the use of commercial standards are largely intangible, due to the fundamental nature of the benefits afforded, such as improved quality of product, increased good will, customer satisfaction, stabilization of trade, etc. Estimating a saving of 2 per cent in the value of production due to the application of commercial standards to the four industries listed above the financial benefits indicated are in excess of \$9,400,000.

From this statement it is clear that there is a saving and financial benefit of at least \$9,400,000, and this for an expenditure of something like \$75,000, which is subscribed by the men who are directly interested. Let us not forget these producers, distributors, as well as consumers are the people thus directly interested in these various products as they are the ones who take the initiative. Recall again that the Bureau of Standards does not enter into any one of these arrangements until a group of manufacturers gets together and requests that it do so, and then it comes into the picture. When they get together, then the specialists of the Bureau of Standards give their advice and counsel, and then the matter is turned over to the manufacturers themselves.

They agree upon these standards, and when they meet certain conditions of the Bureau of Standards then this label of commercial standard is allowed to be put on the product. I think all of you, as practical men, realize the point of that. From the consumers' standpoint no debate is required. It is a worthwhile service, and I am surprised that our good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] should take a pot shot at this particular item. In my opinion, he has gone very wide of the mark of his usual constructive criticism. I commend to him a further study of dress patterns and other items where commercial standards have been published and when he does come to the knowledge that a bachelor really ought to have of dress patterns before he discusses it publicly, I am sure that when this appropriation bill next comes up he will find himself a warm advocate of the Bureau of Standards and a supporter of this item. I sincerely trust no modification of the item will be made and no limitation of the appropriation be countenanced for a moment. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] has covered the subject so well that very little can be added to it. I desire only to read to the committee only one or two sentences covering the subjects which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] believed to be not within the scope of this scientific institution. Without in the slightest intending to belittle the other bureaus of the Government provided for in this bill, my belief is that the Bureau of Standards is the most useful branch of the Government for which we appropriate in this entire bill.

We have had so much experience in waste in this country, especially in the early days, that it was absolutely necessary that we now have a bit of standardization and have as much efficiency and economy in production as is humanly possible in order to compete with manufacturers of foreign countries, where the standard of wage is so low. Take, for instance, this question of dress patterns, which the gentleman from Wisconsin ridicules. There was a time when every manufacturer of dresses had bales of thousands and thousands of pounds of material sold as waste at a fraction of a cent a pound. The dress industry is one of the big and important industries of this country. It employs over half a million people. The matter of patterns does not refer to style at all. It does not refer to color. It does not even refer to the length of the skirt. It refers to the pattern of the material. The research and results of the bureau on this subject can be obtained from the hearings:

I read now from the hearings:

It will also tend to standardize the width of various types of piece goods, since the width of woollens, silks, and cotton recognized for pattern layouts will be used as a basis for listing the quantity of material required for each dress pattern.

Mr. Chairman, the saving of even a half of an inch a yard of material on each dress means the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the dress industry, which, of course, reflects into the cost of the dress to the ultimate purchaser.

Then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] refers to skids. Of course, skids in its political sense does not at all interfere with the law of physics. Skids, politically speaking, are a matter easily understood, and they do not require the study of the Bureau of Standards.

Seriously, though, so important was the research made by the Bureau of Standards in this connection that it will result in enormous savings to railroads and shippers, which again is bound to be to the benefit of the consumer. I will just read a paragraph from the report concerning this work:

Estimates made by the standing committee on material handling in general indicate that possible savings to the railways will amount to \$25,000,000 per year, and that savings to shippers and consignees throughout the country will amount to four or five times this figure. This program is known as simplified practice recommendation No. 95-28 and is available in printed form at the Government Printing Office.

Nothing can be added to the impressive figures of the result of the findings of research on the question of handling freight. So much for skids.

So that here we have a bureau where the industries of the country may pool their difficulties at a low cost and have the best scientific institution in the world at their disposal to make the necessary investigations and obtain real results. The scientific findings of this bureau are daily being applied to every industry in our country. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most useful branches of the American Government and is doing excellent work. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Utilization of waste products from the land: For the survey of the possibilities of the industrial utilization of waste products from the land, including cooperation with colleges, other institutions, and manufacturers, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, \$52,700.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph just read continues an appropriation for the utilization of what have become known as waste farm products.

I want to thank the subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] is chairman and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] a ranking member, for the interest they have taken in this particular appropriation. They were quick to grasp the possibilities of this utilization, and it is now my pleasure to report to them and to the House that these appropriations have brought substantial results.

I think it was four years ago when two men came from Iowa on this mission. One of them was Dr. O. R. Sweeney, head of the chemical and mining engineering department of Iowa State College, at Ames, Iowa, and the other was Dr. Herman Knapp, then acting president of the college. I had long known of Doctor Sweeney and his experimental work. I had known that he had served in the World War as a chemist and that in some useful experiment he had suffered injury to his sense of hearing, a war disability honorably incurred. After the war he plunged into the work of reclaiming the wastes of the farms.

When he came to Washington he called on me because he had knowledge of my interest in similar chemical developments in connection with corn sugar. He told me that in his limited laboratory at Ames—a laboratory that the State of Iowa has since increased—he had gone as far as he could. He wanted to know if Federal assistance could not be obtained. I listened to his story, which read like a story from a fairy book, and told him that I knew of one man who could understand him better than I could, and who could help him, and that man was Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce. I picked up the telephone and succeeded in making a connection with Mr. Hoover. In a few words I explained to him what I wanted. Mr. Hoover said, "Bring him over at once," and I think that he added that he always liked to talk to chemical and engineering "cranks."

It was not necessary for Doctor Sweeney to speak at great length to the Secretary of Commerce. Taking advantage of the doctor's deafness, Mr. Hoover turned to me and said, "He speaks my language all right." Turning to Doctor Sweeney he said, "How much money in your opinion will it take to put the National Government back of your experiments?"

"Fifty thousand dollars," the doctor replied, with characteristic Iowa modesty, and he added that he hoped he was not asking too much.

"Your friend is modest enough," Mr. Hoover whispered to me. "He might well ask for \$500,000 if he can realize one-half of his dreams and not offend my sense of the financial proprieties."

Secretary Hoover called his car and sent me with Doctor Sweeney and Doctor Knapp to call on the Director of the Bureau of Standards, Dr. George K. Burgess. Doctor Burgess needed even less time than Mr. Hoover to be convinced of the merits in Doctor Sweeney's proposition. As a matter of fact, Doctor Burgess himself had already given this matter extended study, and in his preceding annual report he had devoted considerable space to the consideration of these very same agricultural wastes. Having the indorsement of Secretary Hoover and of Director Burgess, both Mr. Hoover and myself presented the matter to President Coolidge, who added his approval and commended the matter to the consideration of the Bureau of the Budget, where it was accepted as a proper appropriation.

There was only one more river to cross, and that was the Appropriations Committee of the House, or, rather, the subcommittee, to which I have already paid my compliments. All of the initial appropriation was not spent at Ames, for under national law the benefits were distributed among colleges doing similar work. The General Assembly of Iowa recognized the participation of the National Government in the experiments at Ames to the extent of appropriating \$150,000 to erect a laboratory and to furnish equipment corresponding with the magnitude and the importance of the work to be carried on.

In this laboratory at Ames, aided by many assistants and by experts of the Bureau of Standards, Doctor Sweeney has worked away, and is still working. He has developed many processes which he has patented in the name of the State of Iowa, seeking not wealth for himself but seeking to promote the welfare of the agricultural people of the State and of the country. I know personally that in the meantime he has received many tempting offers from private corporations. They have held out to him rewards in comparison with which his modest salary at the college is a mere bagatelle. If he had accepted any one of these many offers, no business man could have blamed him. But he was strong enough in his sense of service to the public to refuse all such offers. Like a true man of science, he was content with but little for himself, while he was dreaming of vast things for the public. In the years to come I hope that he may have a monument at Ames or at the capital in Des Moines, 30 miles away. But his best monument will be the work that he has done.

A few weeks ago announcement was made of the organization of a strongly financed corporation—I think with a capital of \$1,000,000—with headquarters in Chicago for the utilization of agricultural wastes, based on the discoveries and developments made by Doctor Sweeney. Among the men prominent in this corporation is Hon. Frank O. Lowden, who hails from a farm home in Hardin County, Iowa, not far from Ames College.

In the initial announcement is included the statement that the corporation will seek to realize commercially the dreams of Doctor Sweeney who will serve as a director and technical adviser, but without giving up his useful work at the college. One plant which will come under the control of this corporation, at Dubuque, Iowa, has already been in successful operation, principally in the manufacture of wall board and other substitutes for lumber.

The assembling of the stalks is one of the main problems to be solved. This assembling must be done at as low a price as possible, so that the products may be offered in competition with the products of the lumber industry. I am informed that a harvesting machine has been developed at Ames under the direction, or at least inspiration, of Doctor Sweeney, that will make it possible to assemble these stalks in an economical manner.

I will not attempt to enlarge upon the uses that can be and that I believe will be made of these products that are now largely going to waste. It is not too much to hope that in due time the pulp of these stalks can be and will be substituted for the wood pulp that we are now importing, I think to the extent of around a quarter of a billion dollars' worth annually in the making of print and other papers. The possibilities are unlimited, and the field is as wide as the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks on this subject and to include therein a letter I have received from Doctor Sweeney.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa, to extend his remarks in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

DOCTOR SWEENEY'S LETTER TO MR. COLE

Hon. CYRENUS COLE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I thought you would be interested to know, if you do not already know, that the agricultural waste business is developing very nicely, and is creating a very favorable impression due to its progress throughout the State of Iowa.

We have recently collected enough capital to commercialize some of these developments, and at the present time we are offering \$10 a ton for the cornstalks delivered at Dubuque. At this figure it is possible for the farmer to make quite a little money. By this time next year we hope to have the collection problem so developed that this will be a very material source of revenue. Due to the location of your district, farmers there are shipping stalks to Dubuque, and the whole project is moving along with, I think, considerable success.

I wanted to drop you this letter to let you know that quite recently we have interested some splendid men representing good finance and agriculture, and the organization called National Cornstalk Processes (Inc.), has been floated with a view to developing the discoveries made here at Ames. I know of no one who has been more helpful in the project than you, and for that reason I wanted you to know about it. I am not sure that the good people of Iowa really recognize the great importance of your help. Whenever I have an opportunity, however, you can believe me when I say that you get proper credit.

I hope that the Government help can be continued, and the Bureau of Standards is going to ask again for the appropriation which you got for us, and I hope that you can still feel your help should be coming to us, and be on the lookout for that item in the Budget when it comes before Congress.

The next time you are in Iowa I hope that we can arrange to go down to Dubuque together. I know you would be pleased with the splendid plant we have in operation there, and I hope that the time is not far off when Iowa will be dotted with just such structures. They are doubling the furfural plant in Cedar Rapids, and we are driving ahead on furfural to try to make it a major chemical for use in the country. I want to see you before very long so I can tell you firsthand just what developments are under way, and what the set-up is.

With my cordial best wishes to you, I am very truly yours,

O. R. SWEENEY,

Professor of Chemical Engineering Iowa State College.

Mr. SHREVE. The committee greatly appreciates the statement which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE] has just made. I recall the proposition which he brought to the attention of the committee four years ago. At that time we did not fully realize that it was possible to obtain the results to which he has just referred to, but we thought that something good might come out of the investigation. I am glad we have carried on those appropriations during these three or four years, and I am delighted to know that they have turned out to the advantage of all the people of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retired pay: For retired pay of officers and employees engaged in the field service or on vessels of the Lighthouse Service, except persons continuously employed in district offices and shops, \$324,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to ask any member of the committee what is the situation with reference to lighthouse keepers who become incapacitated in this service—men who have not lost their status as employees, but who have become permanently disabled. The case I have in mind particularly is one where sometime ago one of the lighthouse keepers became mentally deranged and was sent for treatment to St. Elizabeths Hospital here. The probabilities were that he would never return to duty; but during the time he was undergoing treatment in the hospital he was put on the suspended list and payment of salary was suspended; and as I recollect it he was not allowed to draw any retirement pay. Has that situation been corrected, so that such employees can now get retirement pay and also hospitalization?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I will say to the gentleman that so far as that is concerned, 30 days' annual leave is allowed, but no provision is made to take care of cases of that kind.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand that it is not uncommon for men in the Lighthouse Service to suffer in a limited number of cases from mental derangement. The difficulty for them is to sustain themselves if they can not have their salary; and yet I understand the service is unable to pay them the retirement pay while they are being treated in a Government hospital and being given an opportunity to recover. Something should be done about it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. That is a matter that requires legislation, and the Committee on Appropriations can not handle it at the present time.

Mr. BRIGGS. And legislation has not yet been provided to cover that situation?

Mr. ACKERMAN. It has not been.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commutation of rations (not to exceed \$1 per day) may be paid to officers and crews of vessels of the Bureau of Fisheries during the fiscal year 1931 under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I wonder if the generous chairman of the committee will tell me what they are going to do with this dollar a day as commutation of rations?

Mr. SHREVE. That is for food.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. A dollar a day for food?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I hope the gentleman is not serious in saying that.

Mr. SHREVE. You know that is considerably more than the Navy has.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I thought we had a basic legal rate of \$7 a day?

Mr. SHREVE. This is simply on vessels, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Commissioner of Patents and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$3,474,930, of which amount \$24,100 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed \$25,000 may be used for special and temporary service of typists certified by the Civil Service Commission, who may be employed in such numbers, at \$4 per diem, as may, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Patents, be necessary to keep current the work of furnishing manuscript copies of records.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: On page 93, line 16, after the word "records," strike out the period and insert the following proviso:

"*Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated herein, the sum of \$229,380 shall not be available for use by the Patent Office until legislation pending before the Congress to amend section 476 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes, and section 1 of the trade-mark act of February 20, 1905, as amended, shall be enacted into law."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was prepared by the committee and is submitted with their approval and has the approval of the legislative committee handling patent matters. It was brought to our attention that the legislative committee had unanimously reported a bill providing reasonable increases in patent fees, the purpose being to provide additional temporary employees and to add to the receipts of the Patent Office so as to meet the expense incident to the employment of this temporary force. That bill will likely come before the House next week. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL], who is in charge of the legislative bill, has been consulted as to this proviso and gives his approval to it. Your committee felt we were proceeding in an orderly, businesslike way in proposing this limitation.

It has always been understood, and the committee reporting this legislation has felt that the Patent Office could well stand a slight increase in fees, such as the legislative committee has recommended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is the Bureau of Patents catching up with its work at all?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; they are catching up, and this will enable them to advance more rapidly. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Chairman, I might say in answer to the gentleman from Washington that it is the purpose of the Patent Committee to try and secure appropriations sufficient to employ extra examiners, so that this bureau may be able to give reasonable service to the applicants for patents, which it has not been able to do in the last two years. The Appropriations Committee has been very kind in giving us quite a good deal more of an appropriation this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How far behind is the Patent Office work?

Mr. VESTAL. About 11 months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is about a year behind?

Mr. VESTAL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I want to ask a question of either the chairman of the Committee on Patents or the chairman of the subcommittee. Can either of the gentlemen state the approximate amount paid to examiners in the Patent Office?

Mr. SHREVE. I can answer the gentleman. The salaries run from about \$2,000 to about \$6,600.

Mr. DYER. Are there a number receiving as much as \$6,000?

Mr. SHREVE. They will from now on.

Mr. DYER. So there is a substantial increase provided?

Mr. SHREVE. I think about 17. The intention of the committee was to increase those in the higher brackets.

Mr. DYER. As the gentleman perhaps knows a great part of the work which these examiners ought to be able to do in order to satisfy people is now going to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. My information is that that work is taking up a great part of the time of that court, and that it is getting heavier all the time. My idea was that if you could provide men who are competent and fully qualified to pass upon these matters in the Patent Office it would avoid a great deal of this work leaving the office on appeal.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. You will be interested to know that our committee felt, in view of the study made by the legislative committee, of which the gentleman from Indiana is chairman, we should confer with him; such conference was had and our committees are in full agreement as to what should be done to relieve the situation in the Patent Office.

Mr. VESTAL. May I say this further, that within the last three weeks examiners have been taken out of one grade and placed in a grade higher so that they may receive from \$5,600 to \$6,000 a year.

Mr. DYER. That is very fine information.

Mr. VESTAL. Then we are expecting to have 110 additional examiners to take care of this work.

Mr. DYER. Gentlemen know, of course, that patent litigation is one of the most intricate and difficult parts of the jurisprudence which comes before the courts. It often takes weeks of the time of the court to try a single case because there are so many technical matters and things to be considered and passed upon, and I was hoping that at some time not too far in the future the Committee on Patents would bring to us for consideration legislation to provide for a court of patent appeals, so that the President might secure for that court men who are specially fitted and well qualified to pass upon such intricate and difficult matters. I think that eventually we must have such a court, and probably before very long.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that particular?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The thought suggested by the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. DYER] calls to mind the question that was brought up by President Taft as to whether we should have specialized courts to try appellate matters or whether the appellate court should be one of general jurisdiction to pass on all matters. During his administration, at his urgent request, as many Members recall, Congress created the Court of Commerce Appeals. The legislation was seriously contested in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I was then a member, under the leadership of that great statesman, James R. Mann, and it was only by a narrow majority of one that the bill was reported. This change

of one was the result, more or less, of pressure exerted from the White House. It was seriously contended then that we should have these specialized courts. Later on, after 10 or 12 years of trial, this special appellate court was abolished. There developed in practice serious objections to a one-sided court.

I think the great vice in connection with our patent litigation has been that we have had too poorly paid examiners. A patent of the United States does not have the value of a patent issued, for instance, by Germany. It is only prima facie evidence, when issued by the United States, that it has patentability. At present those charged with infringement of a patent do not regard the patents issued by the United States Patent Office as of any great value, and they go to the district court and contest them, because the Patent Office has been so free in the granting of such patents.

There have been many instances where patents have been granted where such patents were not warranted by conditions, and this is all traceable to the fact that we have not paid adequate salaries to keep our examiners in office. They come out of law school, go through this probationary period in the Patent Office for four or six years, and then go out into private practice with the claimed prestige of having had this experience as examiners of patents in the Patent Office at Washington. The salary has not been alluring enough to retain good and competent men to pass judgment upon the intricacies of the matters submitted, and I question very seriously whether the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER], though it is worthy of consideration, to have a special court of patent appeals, should be adopted, because it has been found by many who have given serious thought to this question to be better to have our appellate courts of general jurisdiction rather than of specialized jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For furniture and filing cases, \$60,000.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether this item of \$60,000 is existing law or whether this appropriation is in addition to existing law, and I will tell the gentleman why I ask the question.

The last time I had occasion to go to the Patent Office, priceless patent records were thrown all over the place. There were no conveniences there for housing them, and if they were lost they could not be duplicated. I called the attention of the chairman last year to this item, and the gentleman said it was being taken care of, and I would now like some information about it.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; we are appropriating about \$60,000 a year for the purpose of taking care of these filing cases, and this is about all they can absorb each year. The work is going along now in fine shape, and I think if the gentleman will pay another visit to this office he will find a different situation.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Then these records will be protected against fire?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; they are all fireproof filing cases.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Helium plants: For helium production and conservation, including acquisition of helium-bearing gas land or wells by purchase, exchange, lease, or condemnation, or interest in such land or wells, the purchase, lease, construction, or modification of plants, pipe lines and accessories, compressor stations, camp buildings, and other facilities for the production, transportation, storage, and purification of helium and helium-bearing gas, including acquisition of sites and rights of way therefor, by purchase, lease, or condemnation, and including supplies and equipment, expenses of travel and subsistence, maintenance and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and all other necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$6,560 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and including the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization carried under this heading in the Department of Commerce appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, \$306,190: *Provided*, That in addition thereto the unexpended balance of the appropriation made under this heading for the fiscal year 1930 is reappropriated and made available for the above purposes for the fiscal year 1931: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made may be expended except with the approval of the President: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may, with the approval of the President, enter into contracts incurring additional obligations not in excess of \$500,000, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That the acquirement of leases, sites, and rights of way under terms customary in the oil and gas industry, including obligations to pay rental in advance and to pay damages to lands, crops, or structures

arising out of the Government's operations, is authorized: *Provided further*, That should valuable products other than helium-bearing gas be discovered in wells acquired or drilled for helium-bearing gas under this appropriation the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide for the disposal of said wells or the products therefrom, by the contracts under which the property is acquired, or otherwise, in accordance with the interests of the Government therein and in the manner which, in his opinion, is most advantageous to the Government.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] whether in the appropriation of \$232,000 for oil, gas, and oil shale investigations, as shown on page 99 of the printed bill, there is included a continuation of the \$6,000 appropriation for such work at the University of Colorado in connection with the United States Government Bureau of Mines.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman, I will say that the committee has carried this item in exactly the same amount, \$232,000, as last year, and last year this operation was carried on in conjunction with the University of Colorado. I have no knowledge of it being proposed not to continue it this year, and in fact it is the recommendation of the committee that it be continued. I feel satisfied that the work will go on the same as it has in the past.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think, as a matter of fact, part of this helium provision is subject to a point of order, but I am not going to raise it.

I simply want to call the committee's attention to this fact: I have read the hearings, and the policy of the committee is to expand helium development through the Bureau of Mines for the purpose of furnishing helium to the Navy and the Army. I have no fault to find with the committee, in trying to save as much money for the Government as it can, but under the basic, fundamental, organic law dealing with helium it was contemplated that this business would go into the hands of private individuals and that the Government, through its Bureau of Mines, would ascertain from time to time whether or not private industry was selling the helium to the Navy and the Army at reasonable prices; and if not, they would buy it from the Government.

Now, the committee has taken the position that they are going to let the Bureau of Mines take over all the helium available. In Potter County, Tex., they have bought some 26,000 acres of land and are supposed to take on 23,000 acres more to establish a supply for 260 years.

That is all well and good as far as it goes, but the proposition here, as I understand it, is to take it out of private hands. You will not let us export helium. Helium is produced in the State of Colorado to a greater percentage than in any other wells discovered yet.

If the private industries of the country can have a chance to live and develop for domestic needs, although we can not ship it out, there are many uses for that gas, especially in the development of the great Zeppelins, which they want to develop in order to have successful air service.

I am not going to quarrel with the committee.

The committee has its own ideas and its own rights, but I call its attention to the fact that the organic law proposed that private individuals should handle the matter, and the Government stay out, except that they would go on and develop it to see if they could extract it at a cheaper price.

I am sorry that my friend the late gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Frothingham, is not here. He was the leader in the adoption of the law relative to helium. In the passage of that bill, in the debate, the position was taken that it was for private industry.

We are trying to get ships into private hands, and we proceed on every other theory to get business into private hands.

I am calling this to the attention of the House because the policy has been to increase the activity of the Bureau of Mines. They are expending and have got it where they are furnishing more than the Navy can take. I do not blame the committee that the Navy should be where it can buy the cheapest, but I call attention to the fact that you will not give private industry a chance to develop this great resource that we have in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1931 the head of any department or independent establishment of the Government having funds available for scientific investigations and requiring cooperative work by the Bureau of Mines on scientific investigations within the scope of the functions of

that bureau and which it is unable to perform within the limits of its appropriations may, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, transfer to the Bureau of Mines such sums as may be necessary to carry on such investigations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer on the books of the Treasury Department any sums which may be authorized hereunder, and such amounts shall be placed to the credit of the Bureau of Mines for the performance of work for the department or establishment from which the transfer is made: *Provided*, That any sums transferred by any department or independent establishment of the Government to the Bureau of Mines for cooperative work in connection with this appropriation may be expended in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman if this is new legislation?

Mr. SHREVE. No; it has been carried for some time—10 years at least.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the department, for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are not specifically made, including the purchase of stationery, furniture, and repairs to the same, carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, laundry, street-car fares, not exceeding \$200; lighting and heating; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of motor cycles and motor trucks; purchase, exchange, maintenance, and repair of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; newspaper clippings not to exceed \$1,800, postage to foreign countries, telegraph and telephone service, typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices; purchase of law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, for which payment may be made in advance; not exceeding \$3,650; in all, \$55,500; and in addition thereto such sum as may be necessary, not in excess of \$13,500, to facilitate the purchase, through the central purchasing office as provided in the act approved June 17, 1910 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 7), of certain supplies for the Immigration Service, shall be deducted from the appropriation "Expenses of regulating immigration" made for the fiscal year 1931 and added to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of Labor," for that year; and the total sum thereof shall be and constitute the appropriation for contingent expenses for the Department of Labor, to be expended through the central purchasing office (Division of Publications and Supplies), Department of Labor: *Provided*, That expenditures from appropriations contained in this act for the maintenance, upkeep, and repair, exclusive of garage rent, pay of operator, fuel, and lubricants, on any one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle used by the Department of Labor shall not exceed one-third of the market price of a new vehicle of the same make or class, and in any case not more than \$500: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Department of Labor when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed the sum of \$50.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 108, line 13, by striking out the figures "1,800" and inserting the figures "1,300."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 108, line 13, strike out the sign and figures "\$1,800" and insert sign and figures "1,300."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this item is for clippings from newspapers not exceeding \$1,800. The amendment proposed reduces it to \$1,300. If that should be carried, I will offer an amendment at the bottom of the next page to increase the sum from \$240,000 for printing to \$240,500. That is so in the hope the department can print enough of the copies of the laws and regulations in relation to immigration to supply the Members of the House with what they need, as well as supply the requests from lawyers and others.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Department of Labor, including all its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, District of Columbia, and elsewhere, \$240,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 109, line 24, strike out "\$240,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$240,500, of which \$500 shall be available at once."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is the amendment that is a companion to the other one.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Traveling expenses of special agents and employees; experts and temporary assistance for field service outside of the District of Columbia, to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$8 per day; personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed \$30,500, including also temporary statistical clerks, stenographers, and typewriters in the District of Columbia, to be selected from civil-service registers, the same person to be employed for not more than six consecutive months; traveling expenses of officers and employees, purchase of periodicals, documents, envelopes, price quotations, and reports and material for reports and bulletins of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$88,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 110, line 15, strike out "\$88,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$90,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, that is an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, we have already increased that item \$2,000 in anticipation of the wants and requirements of the department. I think we ought not to be asked to give more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman is satisfied that \$88,000 is enough to take care of the statistics, very well, but I believe that Congress itself will soon be calling for many additional statistics from the Department of Labor.

Mr. SHREVE. We gave them \$2,000 over and above the bureau estimates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For the year beginning July 1?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. This is all the department asked for?

Mr. SHREVE. It is \$2,000 more than the department asked for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Regulating immigration: For enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the contract labor laws; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce said laws, including not to exceed \$213,300 for personal services and temporary employees in the District of Columbia, together with persons authorized by law to be detailed for duty at Washington, D. C.; traveling expenses; care, detention, maintenance, and transportation of aliens incident to deportation as authorized by law, to, through, or in foreign countries; enforcement of the provisions of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," and acts amendatory thereof and in addition thereto (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 101-339; U. S. C. Supp. III, title 8, secs. 102-298); necessary supplies, including exchange of typewriting machines, alterations and repairs, and for all other expenses authorized by said act; preventing the unlawful entry of aliens into the United States by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto; expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expenses of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation; refunding of head tax, maintenance bills, and immigration fines upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection was made through error of Government officers; all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, \$8,850,000: *Provided*, That \$1,768,400 of this amount shall be available only for coast and labor-border patrol: *Provided further*, That the purchase, exchange, use, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles and allowances for horses, including motor vehicles and horses owned by immigration officers when used on official business required in the enforcement of the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws outside of the District of Columbia

may be contracted for and the cost thereof paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of those laws, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not more than \$165,000 of the sum appropriated herein may be expended in the purchase and maintenance of such motor vehicles, and of such sum of \$165,000 not more than \$125,000 shall be available for the purchase and maintenance of motor vehicles for coast and land-border patrol.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 112, line 4, strike out "\$8,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,950,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if this amendment shall prevail it will add \$100,000 to the lump sum for the enforcement of all of the immigration laws in detail, deportation, and so on, covered in the page and a half of the bill just read. If that should be agreed to, I shall then offer an amendment in the next line striking out "\$1,868,440" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,968,440," so that the \$100,000 shall be for the coast and land border patrol for immigration purposes. I do not care to take the time of the committee to show the need for that. Let me say, however, that the whole Labor Department now comes within about \$1,000,000 or so of being supported by the income from immigration and naturalization activity. At one time the whole Immigration Service was more than self-supporting, but the restriction of immigration and the setting up of the immigration border patrol changed the situation. The whole appropriation in Title IV, Department of Labor, is about \$12,000,000 plus. The amount in this bill for the whole immigration section of the Department of Labor is proposed to be \$8,850,000 for the next fiscal year. Immigration activities are more than three-fourths of the cost of the department. I spoke of the income. I desire to call attention to this so-called registry, which is a registry of those who lived here prior to June 3, 1921, and who make application, is getting under way slowly. That is the act of March 4 last. The machinery was very slow in getting under way for want of money. Some money had to be used in advance. So out of the money about to be appropriated and noted as an increase \$200,000 is already gone in setting up the machinery for the so-called registry, which brings in \$20 for each person who was here prior to June 3, 1921, who applies to get his record square. Suppose 20,000 people from now on to the end of this next fiscal year apply.

That would amount to \$400,000 additional income. Naturalization is still going on at a pretty good rate, in spite of greatly increased fees, which began to be charged after July 1, last. Just before the last Congress adjourned the fee for full naturalization was raised from \$5 to \$20. The \$20 is not all paid at one time.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Was not that provided for in the last Budget for the additional expense?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think not. Of course, I do not get exact inside information as to the expenditure of all of the money appropriated, but \$200,000 appropriated for other purposes is gone for the registry purpose.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. If we enacted this new legislation, surely we made an appropriation for it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No. It was right at the end of the Congress. There was no appropriation. It is the act of March 4, 1920. For some reason it was not thought advisable to place the sum in a deficiency bill last fall during the extra session.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. The gentleman is more familiar with naturalization matters than I.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Perhaps with certain of the newer laws, but probably not nearly so well posted on details of appropriations as the gentleman from New York. We are appropriating now for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next, and \$200,000 of what we are appropriating is already gone.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I thought perhaps we had already appropriated for it in the previous Budget.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; and besides when we reach July 1 more money will be gone, although still more will be coming into the Federal Treasury from naturalization sources.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, there is an item now pending before the deficiency committee of \$350,000 to cover the item the gentleman has in mind. We can not agree with the gentleman from Washington, much as we would like to. We have increased the appropriation for regulation of immigration by

\$885,000. The \$350,000 now pending before the deficiency committee will make a very large and substantial sum, one that we feel they can get along with very easily. Another thing, we must take into consideration the fact of the proposed consolidation of several activities. I think for the present you will see that we are appropriating all of the money that we should. Later on, if these consolidations go on, we will probably bring it before the deficiency subcommittee again, and we shall endeavor to carry on the service in good, first-class style.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In other words, the apprehension of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has been fully met. We will provide not only needed deficiencies, but for the fiscal year 1931 we are appropriating an amount sufficient to cover what will be provided for as a deficiency and adding thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not the time to read into the Record the increases made by the committee over the estimates of the Budget. Increases have been made; that much has been gained, and I congratulate the committee. But, roughly speaking, the appropriations are, in a round way, only half of what was asked for by the department for the immigration border patrol. Now, about the proposed unified border patrol. All Members know that new legislation comes slowly, even when badly needed, and a unified border patrol system is not likely to be set up for some time. Our committee has had bills for that purpose before it for three or four years. We have given it a great deal of study. Take just one question—as to whether these men will be enlisted in a military system. Quite a problem. Will the men in the proposed military system have rations provided? A great deal of testimony is available in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Each Member of Congress will receive from the Immigration Committee to-morrow a digest of the different statutes which apply at the borders. It is worth looking at, in view of the proposed legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when Congress raises the naturalization fee and sets up a new system of registration whereby a good sum of money is derived from it, the least that can be done is to provide adequate appropriations for the border patrol. At present, in one instance, at a key point on the north border, for the covering of a distance of 80 or 90 miles, but few guards are furnished. In that one small State a great many smuggled immigrants are being run through. It is an impossible task to prevent it with the present force that is provided. How many Members know that it is the Immigration Service that now plays a great hand in preventing the smuggling of liquor and merchandise?

Mr. SHREVE. This committee, some years ago, made a trip on the border, and we were delighted to see the kind of men who were carrying out the laws there. We did not find the conditions such as the gentleman from Washington has mentioned. Up in the State of Vermont, where it is said that many violations of the law occur, they assisted us in every way to ascertain the facts. Now, really, we feel that we have appropriated all that we should, because the Budget Bureau put strong pressure before the committee. I believe that the appropriations that we have provided should stand until the time when the border patrol is extended. We shall be in session next fall.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This appropriation, so I understand, does not increase the border patrol by one man. Here is the gentleman from Vermont himself [Mr. GIBSON], and he can tell you about the conditions on the Vermont border. Of course, I am almost single handed here, and if the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union can not see the true situation, I realize the hopelessness of budging those who are urged, on both sides of the House, to stand by the committee. I think this is the last appeal I shall make for the immigration border patrol.

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman says this is the last appeal he will make for an increased border patrol?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. If this addition to the lump sum is granted I shall then move that this increase of \$100,000 be used for the extension of the border patrol. We need increases every year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, yeas 17.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that does not affect the vote in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If I am permitted to do so, Mr. Chairman, I will ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SHREVE and Mr. JOHNSON of Washington to act as tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 9, yeas 76.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is one time when I agree with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. It seems to me he is well qualified to advise the Committee of the Whole as to certain problems that confront him daily in the committee hearings. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will give study to some of the problems which confront the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization daily, some of the problems that we can not answer or attempt to solve because of lack of sufficient funds in that department to carry on the work.

I might not agree with the gentleman that an appropriation of \$100,000 is going to do the very thing he thinks it is going to do. I do not agree with a number of Members of the House that they are going to put the fear of God into every criminal and stop crime. Crime will continue after all of us are gone, and there is not enough money to wipe out crime.

But let me call your attention to something more in this provision. In March, 1929, the Congress of the United States passed a law legalizing persons illegally in the United States. Technically there was no record of their entry, and thousands of these men and women married American citizens; they have American families; they want to be part and parcel of us; they want to stand and undertake the burdens of citizenship, but we could not give it to them. We passed a law March 3, 1929, authorizing the legalization of these persons up to June 3, 1931, but what money have we appropriated to carry out this provision of law? To-day there are thousands of applications on file of these men and women who present themselves for examination and establish their status in the United States, but we have no machinery and we have no money sufficient to carry out this measure. If we had enough money and machinery, we could legalize all persons who are law-abiding, who are men and women of good standing in their communities and once and for all clean house.

At the present time and at the rate you are going, if you are squabbling about a few dollars and appropriating \$400,000,000 for the eighteenth amendment, you might as well turn over the whole Treasury of the United States of America, and yet you can not enforce the eighteenth amendment—but this is a law you can enforce and make people respect the country and the roof that they live under. Give them an opportunity once and for all to settle in the land of liberty. At the present time you have no means to do so, because of the lack of a few dollars, but you are throwing away millions of dollars, even billions of dollars, for something that you can not at the present time, and for many years to come, enforce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The law the gentleman speaks of passed just at the close of the last session of Congress. It provided a fee of \$20 and applies to those here up until June, 1931. About 1,800 or 2,000 cases have been acted upon and there are 18,000 awaiting action. It is a slow process at best. It takes a week to examine the records submitted by the candi-

date, who pays \$20 for a chance to get a square footing in the United States, and he must have been here prior to 1921.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is right. Not alone that, but it must be borne in mind, as the chairman of the Immigration Committee well said, that the fees derived from this business will be more than sufficient to maintain this department; but at the same time it is like every other business—you have got to have some capital to start the ball rolling. If we are going to pass laws and make no appropriation and make the favorite child of this House the eighteenth amendment, we might as well close up shop and let a handful of men control the situation. Why can we not turn around and give respect to other laws which we pass in the Congress of the United States, just as we do the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act? I say to you that if a man has been here for 20 years and you give him the right to be a citizen, why not do it now? Why give him a merry-go-round for the next four or five years, which will be the case at the rate you are making appropriations? I say, furthermore, that laws of this kind, if you will put them into force, will bring contentment in all communities—in the big cities, on the farms, and in the country. Incidentally, let me call the attention of the committee to the fact that the act which legalizes all entries up to June 3, 1921, should be amended so as to include all those who came to the United States prior to July 1, 1924. My bill, H. R. 6852, covers the situation. This bill has the approval of the Commissioner General of Immigration and I believe it has the approval of all right-thinking men and women of this country.

Consider this situation. Under our deportation laws we can not deport any of the aliens who arrived here prior to July 1, 1924. The limitation period of five years have elapsed under section 19 of the immigration act of 1917 under which they could have been deported prior to July 1, 1929.

I can not see any intelligent reason why people should be permitted to roam at large in this country, engage in their regular business without interference from the immigration authorities, and yet, even though they be of excellent character and have married American women and have raised American families, they can never reap the advantage of their Americanization by becoming American citizens of this country and become active in the management of its affairs and contribute to its welfare. They have become men without a country and yet we associate with them in our daily life and in business and, in some cases, they employ hundreds of men in their industries, which makes this country an outstanding factor in the world.

If we are having trouble getting appropriations for legalizations up to that time, what will happen with the very persons I now speak about? As a matter of fact the fees imposed upon them for legalization will more than offset the expense of conducting the necessary investigations and I predict a surplus will be left in the Treasury of the United States so that no money is taken from the Treasury for the purpose of enforcing the law already passed or which we contemplate passing so as to put everyone on an equal basis.

As an illustration, the Labor Department has received fees which we increased a year ago, which has brought into the Treasury enough money almost to run the whole department except for \$1,000,000 and, as time goes on, additional fees will be procured which will make a surplus of income from this revenue alone. Surely, Congress should take some judicial notice of that fact as this is practically the only department that can make a showing of this kind and is not a drain on the Public Treasury. On the contrary, it may result in a reduction of general taxes from its revenue.

While I am on the floor discussing this important question may I call attention of Congress to a number of bills that are now pending before the Committee on Immigration which I hope will soon be reported out for action to the House, and which will bring about a house cleaning and a better understanding amongst our alien population in the United States.

I am mindful of the fact that the Members of the House have many important questions confronting them daily and are sometimes unable to acquaint themselves with these human problems, but I think the time has come when we must brush other matters aside and settle this immigration problem so that we may bring happiness to American citizens who are having great difficulty in bringing together their immediate families because of our immigration laws.

I am not urging an open door at this time, nor do I contend that we should let in more people than we can absorb; but the people I am referring to are the fathers and mothers of American citizens who should be exempt from the quota, as under the present law we merely grant them a preference—which means nothing in some countries. They should be permitted to come in without any quota limitation.

I also have a bill pending which deals with exemption from the quota of husbands of American citizens. Formerly you enacted a bill giving the husband the right to bring in his wife and minor children, but you deprive the woman citizen from bringing in her husband. We contend that we are giving the American woman the same equal rights as citizens of the United States by the nineteenth amendment. Just think of it. Here we have the nineteenth amendment giving equal suffrage to men and women, nevertheless, by an act for which you voted in 1924 and 1928, you say in so many words by your vote, that you will not permit an American girl to marry a foreign husband. If she does, it is at her own peril, and while he is to be in a preference class, this preference, as has been pointed out, may and may not mean anything. How can you answer that to your constituents?

I therefore respectfully appeal to the Appropriations Committee not to limit its activities to the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment which brought about more discontent and corruption and disregard and disrespect for the law than anything ever passed by this or any other Congress. If you do make appropriations for the Department of Labor, see to it that they are adequate, and that it should permit the department to carry on its important work and laws which can be enforced as they were intended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has referred to the situation existing along the northern border of the State of Vermont and has said that that is a great funnel through which flows many violations of law. That is true.

What is the situation? We have 90 miles of border along the Canadian front. We have in that 90 miles 59 traveled roads coming from Canada. To the east of us New Hampshire has one, and further to the east Maine has one in 150 miles. Therefore, for 200 miles there are only two traveled roads from Canada to the east of us until you arrive near the New Brunswick border of the State of Maine. I have one county in my district with over 30 traveled roads crossing into Quebec. For the 59 roads we have a border patrol of 12. The chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SHREVE] has referred to his trip to our State. I presume he will remember his visit to North Troy.

Mr. SHREVE. With a great deal of pleasure, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. Of course, the gentleman knows, if he has the situation there in mind, that we have 12 roads right around North Troy coming in from Canada. At the present time for those 12 roads we have one immigration patrol. The result is that there is a great amount of smuggling of aliens, narcotics, and of liquor. The amount of liquor that is smuggled down through our State is tremendous. My State has become the great rum-running avenue for the rest of New England and the eastern part of this country, by reason of its geographical situation.

Now, the border immigration patrol is doing a wonderful work. It is made up of men of a high degree of intelligence; they are industrious; they know their work and they are honest. It is a specialized service, more so than any of the other border services, because the men who are dealing with immigration require a special knowledge of the laws and must use care and excellent judgment in the performance of their duties. I have every good word of commendation for that high class of men who are stationed along our northern border, both in the immigration and customs services.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. The gentleman would not favor and recommend an appropriation that would put some officer on each one of these 59 roads, would he?

Mr. GIBSON. I do not see any other way to fully enforce the laws of this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman be good enough to advise the House how many miles of border he has on the Canadian side, starting with Rouses Point?

Mr. GIBSON. I think there are about 15 miles in addition to what I have given you, and that would make about 105 miles on the border from Rouses Point east to the New Hampshire line.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Independent of the one hundred and some miles?

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, no. We have 90 miles along the border and then, I think, from our State line to Rouses Point is about 15 miles.

So it is a condition that confronts us. There is a great hole there that ought to be plugged up.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my office petitions signed by 500 Vermont citizens residing along the Canadian border, merchants, city officials, men of the highest standing, praying that something may be done by the Congress to bring about better enforcement of the law. The trouble is not with the law or the laws; the trouble is we have not a sufficient border patrol or a sufficient number of men engaged along the border in the enforcement of the laws of this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Has the gentleman presented these facts to the Wickersham commission with respect to the amount of liquor being smuggled into this particular territory?

Mr. GIBSON. Not yet; but I expect to do so.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does not the gentleman think it is very important to advise the commission of those facts?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I offer no apology in rising at this time when we are in the midst of a discussion of the problem of labor and immigration.

This is a question which is intimately related with the American-Philippine problem. I do not say Philippine problem, but American-Philippine problem, because it is my sincere hope that more and more we may recognize the fact that the Philippine phase has an intimate bearing upon every important problem presented for solution before the Congress of the United States meriting the thoughtful consideration of the Members.

Just now in the Philippine Islands the people are in the throes of suffering because of the benumbing effect of economic and political uncertainty. If the people of this country have suffered, economically speaking, because of the uncertainty of the pending tariff question, the Filipino people have suffered more than the American people can ever suffer, because this uncertainty is aggravated by the distance between the United States and the Philippine Islands and the lack of familiarity on the part of our people, similar to that which exists here, with what is going on in the governmental circles of this country.

I have risen on this occasion to present to the membership of this House the grave problem of immigration, which sooner or later must be faced squarely by the American Government and the American people. Even now it has already reached an acute stage.

From coast to coast the papers of this country in the last few days, Mr. Chairman, have been full of news of the trouble that has arisen on the Pacific coast by virtue of a clash—which may be economic, may be social, or may be racial—directly resulting from the influx of Filipino laborers.

I hold in my hand a sample of the news of the "epidemic of riotous outbreaks," to use the words in the heading, because of the presence of a considerable number of Filipino laborers in the West.

I am not going to discuss who is to blame for these troubles, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe the Congress of the United States is greatly concerned with that aspect of the question. I have faith in the courts of California, I have faith in the peace officers of this Government, and having faith in the courts and in the peace officers, I feel confident that that phase will be accorded the justice which the situation merits.

Some say the Filipinos are to blame; others say that the white laborers have been the aggressors. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of this, because, as I have said, in due time it will be settled in the courts. But what I want to point out is this, Mr. Chairman. There are to-day in this country over 65,000 Filipino laborers, and according to conservative estimates, some 10,000 to 12,000 Filipinos are coming to the United States every year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSIAS. With pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman know what kind of advertisements are put out in the Philippine Islands to encourage these laborers to come here?

Mr. OSIAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What are they?

Mr. OSIAS. The American shipping interests are placarding the entire Philippines with the allurements of this country. These advertisements are being translated into the different Philippine languages seeking to depict this country as the land of opportunity, and in response to the propaganda of these interests Filipinos have come in great numbers. And with what result?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. OSIAS. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman object to having these men come into this country because of these advertisements?

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I will come to that presently. Let me first finish this answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me put it in another way. Does not the gentleman know that when people from the Philippines are practically imported into this country, then when mills shut down on account of overproduction and stay shut down for two months, and open up again and find the Filipinos in the places of the white men who are trying to build homes here, there is bound to be trouble?

Mr. OSIAS. Bound to be trouble! I am glad we are both agreed that there is bound to be trouble. If there is to be trouble, it behooves every Member of this Congress, it behooves every official of the Government of the United States, Mr. Chairman, to face the question squarely and apply the proper remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippines has expired.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Philippines?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. I do not know that the Filipinos are to blame. We are living under the United States flag; we have been enticed by alluring advertisements presenting this country as a land of golden opportunity. Can you blame the Filipinos for coming here?

The anomaly and the remedy, that is the thing that concerns you and me, Mr. Chairman. The anomaly is that we are under the American flag and we are not eligible to American citizenship, which is the greatest benefit that the flag confers.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSIAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARBOUR. If you put up your own flag over there, will you keep your people at home?

Mr. OSIAS. The gentleman knows that when we are granted independence the Philippine Islands would, ipso facto, be under the category of a foreign nation. Then, for purposes of immigration, we shall be placed on a quota basis, like the peoples of other foreign nations.

There is pending before the House of Representatives a bill providing for the exclusion of citizens of the Philippine Islands from the United States. If that bill passes while we are under the American flag, it will be a great injustice. The remedy is to see that the American-Philippine question be immediately brought up before the Congress for final solution. The only proper remedy to this and allied problems lies in granting us complete independence. [Applause.]

Mr. BARBOUR. What I want to get at is this: After the Philippine Islands have independence will they be willing to be treated by the United States in every respect as other foreign governments?

Mr. OSIAS. Yes, sir. If independent, we will be willing to be treated as other foreign governments, not only from the standpoint of immigration and labor but from the standpoint of the tariff—and I wish the people and Congress of the United States never to have any doubt about that. The Filipino people have carefully weighed the consequences of freedom, and they are prepared to shoulder the obligations and responsibilities that go with independence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSIAS. I yield gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not want to embarrass the gentleman, but the only class of people in the Philippine Islands who can be naturalized are those who have served a certain length of time in the Navy. Would the gentleman like to see that amendment, which was passed in war times, repealed?

Mr. OSIAS. I am willing to take the consequences that go with freedom, and there are 13,000,000 Filipinos behind me when I make that statement. [Applause.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSIAS. I yield again.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Until the people of the Philippine Islands have their independence, what solution would the gentleman recommend?

Mr. OSIAS. Every step that the Congress of the United States will take, short of independence, will be a makeshift arrangement, and it will be transient and temporary at best. Any solution other than freedom only touches the surface and does not go to the fundamental issue involved in the American-Filipino relations.

Mr. Chairman, the other day in the course of a brilliant and informative address by the gentleman from Arkansas, for which we are very grateful, there was a colloquy between him and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PALMER], with respect to our having or not having a flag. The gentleman from Missouri contended that the Filipinos are protected under the same flag that the Americans in Missouri are protected, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] contended that the Filipinos have no flag that they can call their own.

Mr. Chairman, both the gentlemen are correct. In a sense we have a flag in the Stars and Stripes, for it was taken across the sea, which symbolized the purpose of the United States. We welcomed it because we were assured that the flag meant liberty and independence.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does not the gentleman recognize that we took the country out of a horrible condition and spent millions of dollars to improve it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippines has expired.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman, make it five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Commissioner from the Philippines asks for only two minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Commissioner from the Philippines be granted five minutes.

Mr. OSIAS. Very well, Mr. Chairman, I shall amend by asking that it be five minutes, since the gentlemen seem so insistent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Members on both sides of the House for their generosity. It is true—and it is universally acknowledged—that that flag was unfurled there for a purpose at once patriotic, humanitarian, and altruistic. You will not find Filipinos who begrudge the credit that is due that wonderful ensign of this Republic. I am one who has been the beneficiary not only of the legacy that my race can give, but I am the beneficiary of the social institutions of the United States, and so I think I can interpret the spirit of my people truly when I say that we are not disposed to quibble as to the great advantages that have accrued to my country by virtue of the benign protection extended by that flag; but precisely because that flag has been so great and so wonderful, precisely because we are pleased to recognize that America has been so successful in her work in the Philippines, we now come to you and say that the greatest manifestation of gratitude that we can show you is no longer to tie ourselves to the apron strings of a benign guardian but to ask that you set us free.

The conscience of my people every hour is appealing to the soul of America. Our people are saying to you: "Free us from our political uncertainty. Save us from the present economic anomaly. Permit us to enjoy the blessing of complete liberty." That is the plea of my people, and that is the appeal which I on their behalf most earnestly voice on the floor of Congress to-day.

Mr. Chairman, because of a sincere desire to contribute, not my bit but my utmost, to the solution of this question, not only because I am desirous to advance the cause of my native land, but because I desire to see America freed from the troubles that lurk by virtue of the present relationship, I stand here to-day and make this appeal.

I appeal to all to take a more active interest in the speedy solution of the American-Philippine problem. In the past there were some who were wont to dwell upon the alleged dire consequences upon the Filipinos should independence be granted. It is high time that thinking Americans and Filipinos concern themselves, not with the alleged dire consequences upon us by the granting of early independence, but with the dire consequences, immediate and remote, attendant upon the unnecessary delay of the grant of Philippine independence.

There are measures now pending before Congress seeking to authorize the Filipino people to hold a constitutional convention, approve a constitution which shall be the fruition of our mentality and which will reflect the republican and democratic spirit of your Constitution, and organize a free and independent Philippine government. The only right solution is the grant of the independence that you have promised us, the fulfillment of which my people anxiously await. When you will have done that, Mr. Chairman and Members, not only the Filipino people but the whole world will know that that starry flag, wherever it may go, is the symbol not of subjugation but of liberation. [Applause.] liberation.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you are hearing a discussion of a real live human problem. As a member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization I have received during the last few weeks some hundreds of communications from the State of California and the Pacific coast, forecasting just such conditions as the Commissioner from the Philippines [Mr. OSIAS] just presented to this House. I do not know what will be the solution. I know that the people of the Pacific coast are becoming restive under present conditions. I do not know whether it will be possible or whether it will be thought wise for the Congress of the United States to exclude the Filipino people while under our jurisdiction to the extent that they now are, but I warn you that these troubles which this gentleman, the Commissioner from the Philippines, so eloquently presents this morning are just beginning. His estimate of the number of his people in the State of California corresponds with the estimates which have been furnished me. The Filipino people are coming in in considerable numbers. They will continue to come. They are presenting another serious racial question. America has had enough of such troubles. They must not be permitted to accumulate. They have done us untold injury in the past and they threaten to do still greater injury in the future. Our great Civil War resulted from a similar question. Some said that they must have certain kinds of labor.

They said it because people in some sections found it profitable to engage in the traffic of bringing black laborers over and selling them. They were sold to the section where their labor was most needed. It was said that nobody but the black people could open the swamps and dig ditches, that nobody could stand the semitropical climate but them. When it was proposed in the Constitutional Convention that this shameful traffic, which was an eternal dishonor to the white race, should continue until 1808, Mr. Madison rose and said two things; first, that the dishonor would be complete, and that the mischief done would be irreparable if it went on for another 20 years. We had a great race question as the result. We had the Civil War. We had all of the calamities that came to the great section of the country from which I come, all as a result of a short-sighted attitude permitting present financial interests to dominate, when a vision such as Mr. Madison had would have shown the Nation a path which would have avoided 50 years of strife, a ruinous Civil War, the strife which has followed, and the Negro race question which remains with us.

I do not know whether the separation of the Philippine Islands from the United States would solve this question. My own judgment is that it would help. I sympathize with their aspirations. I believe that questions affecting our tariff, and this question, would be simplified by granting them independence. Something must be done. And may I remind you that we are permitting these questions to multiply. These are not the only people against whom there are occasional uprisings. A man appeared before your committee this morning. He is an American-born man, but he is of the race from the south of the Rio Grande. He said:

We have been under a handicap, we have been treated as an inferior race, we have not been accorded equality under the Stars and Stripes, we have not had a chance—

speaking of and for the great Mexican people against whom nobody who is worthy to sit in this Hall entertains any bitterness. His remarks only faintly illustrate the fact that we are creating another tremendous race question, when we admit great numbers of foreign-born Mexicans to the United States on the same specious pleas which have been made for the admission of all the great classes of alien laborers whom it has ultimately been found necessary to exclude.

I call your attention to the fact that we have something like 2,000,000 foreign-born Mexicans accumulating in the United States now. Something must be done. We had trouble some years ago on account of the immigration of orientals—the Chinese. The people demanded their exclusion. Labor importers said we must have them. The State Department made a treaty providing that they had an inalienable right to come. Fortunately the public sentiment of the country did not follow the unwisdom of the State Department concerning that contention. Acts were passed by Congress from time to time to limit their coming. Under the advice of the State Department these were at first vetoed by the Executive. Then there was bloodshed. Finally Congress excluded them and the trouble was settled.

Then there came trouble caused by the coming of Japanese, subjects of a great and friendly power. After years of strife we arrived at some solution of that question by Congress rising to its dignity and exercising the functions vested in it by the Constitution. It had to do this against the influence and advice of the State Department. The Congress said, "We will regulate this question," and as soon as Congress acted the question was settled.

I, as one member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and as a Member of this House, wonder what is to become of the Philippine question. They are a very numerous people and a wide-awake people. We do not want to see a repetition between Americans and them of those unfortunate experiences which have occurred heretofore between our people and other orientals. I believe our people and theirs will be greater friends through the generations of the future if they are allowed to fly their flag while we fly ours. If, because of racial differences, we can not live in peace as neighbors in the same land, we can at least live as friends as separate nations, enjoying the blessings of peace under separate flags. [Applause.]

This whole debate illustrates the fact that people throughout the world look on this land as a country of great opportunity. But times of depression come. We are advised that some millions of our fellow men here at home are in distress because of economic conditions. That argues for the maintenance of your immigration laws and for writing other laws excluding people who are so different as to be undesirable. Some of these foreign races who have come here are here to stay. The colored people are. They did not push themselves on us. We went and brought them here in chains and placed them here, and they are entitled to fair treatment. But we must not have more of these serious race questions accumulating as they are. You are dealing with one of the big questions that will affect the United States throughout its future history. You may make a mistake here and there about the tariff, for example, or about other measures without fatal consequences, but this is a question whether we shall make our Nation a great amalgamation of peoples and groups who can not live in peace, and who will either strive against each other throughout the future or if they do not strive and fight, may blend together in a mongrel type that will not represent the best element of any people in that life. [Applause.] It also involves future freedom. Only a people who know how to maintain and use freedom can remain free.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Those of us who regard this problem as of vital importance are confronted with this difficulty, among many: When we come before the House or before anybody else who has anything to do with appropriations and say, "We need more money in order to make these laws effective, to prevent conditions such as have been described by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Gibson]—and I think he did not exaggerate them but stated conditions typical of those prevailing elsewhere on our borders; when we come before you and say, "These laws are not being enforced on account of lack of appropriations," we are told to write more laws. When we propose to write more laws we are told by the State Department that we need only to enforce the laws we have.

I have criticized the Department of Labor on other occasions, but I want to say that its work in the main is entitled to better support than Congress has given it. When we bring these conditions to the attention of Congress some people in the executive department and some here say, "You must write some more necessary laws; and, when you do that, the Budget or Congress will provide more money for your important work; and when we do propose to enact legislation, then some representative of the executive department says, "You do not need more laws, but you need to execute the laws you have." Substantially, that is being now said by the State Department to prevent legislation which many of us know to be necessary. One group before whom we come say, "You have already all the laws you need."

I do not say this in criticism of anybody, certainly not in criticism of members of the Appropriations Committee, who seem to feel bound to follow, more or less closely, the Budget recommendations submitted to them. Personally, I believe the Budget idea is being abused and made a limitation upon the freedom of Congress, which the Constitution provided.

I also believe that the State Department is not warranted in its efforts to interfere with the legislative freedom of Congress. There is sound constitutional support for this statement. Moreover, the history of the functioning of the State Department in

undertaking to control immigration questions by treaty or otherwise shows an almost unbroken series of failures, to some of which I have already referred.

When you let the State Department control immigration questions through its negotiations, you give foreign powers a voice in our immigration policy, which violates the spirit and purpose of the Constitution and forces our country to consult the rest of the crowded, starving, and striving world about the class of people which shall be admitted to help shape the future of America.

Gentlemen, the fact is the executive department and the Congress of the United States and, I fear, the American people, have not come to a full appreciation of the magnitude and importance of this situation. The Labor Department is not being properly supported. This great subject is not receiving the consideration which it should have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BOX. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman from Texas has stated the situation very nicely. The sentiment is that we should do something to protect the border. The question is, What is the use of enacting laws when you do not get the appropriations necessary to carry out the laws that we do enact? We had but nine supporters to-day who by their votes indicated that they want us to get a little more money.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I confess a certain amount of ignorance on this matter. But on the question of the Filipinos will the gentleman from Texas state at this time what his interpretation is of our right under the Constitution to prohibit or substantially restrict the immigration from the Philippine Islands to the United States?

Mr. BOX. I doubt whether the gentleman from Texas should state here any hasty and possibly irritating opinion on that subject. He will, however, risk the suggestion that Congress could, if it desired, restrict immigration from the Philippine Islands, but he doubts very seriously whether or not it will be thought expedient to do it, in view of the present political relations between the two countries. The Philippines should be granted their independence and immigration from those regions should be restricted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, we find there are two ways it can be done—one by an amendment of the Jones Act, passed about 1916, an enabling act for unorganized insular possessions, and the other way would be to amend the original naturalization laws passed in the late seventeen hundreds by striking out the words that were added after the War between the States. The last amendment would refer to the section in the 1924 act which forbids an immigrant who can not be naturalized to stay in the country. Both of them, however, would be roundabout ways.

Mr. BOX. The fact is, however, that blood has been spilled on the Pacific coast. I have read of two or three recent riots there, in some of which some people were killed. There have heretofore been some other such riots. I fear there will be yet more. Their offense has been that of seeking a place in our industrial system, and we must rectify our relations with them in some way that will leave us in a better position to deal adequately with that question. In any event, something will have to be done soon. Meantime we should be acting to prevent the creation of a race question between our people and alien Mexicans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOBBS. It is exceedingly unfortunate that there has been broadcast throughout the press of this country in the last few days matter reflecting on the character and reputation of Col. John Herbert, recently in charge of prohibition enforcement in this district with headquarters at Baltimore, and of recent date transferred to Montana in charge of prohibition enforcement in that territory.

Colonel Herbert is a constituent of mine and also a personal friend of several years' standing. His reputation in his home city of Worcester, Mass., is of the best. He rendered distinguished service in the late World War, attaining the rank of colonel of one of the artillery regiments of the Yankee Division. His integrity has always been unquestioned, and I deprecate the attacks which have been made upon it, apparently without

foundation, and I am glad to learn that the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of prohibition enforcement has issued a statement declaring in no uncertain terms that the action of the prohibition department in transferring Colonel Herbert from Baltimore to Montana in no way was intended to reflect upon Colonel Herbert's honesty or integrity as a prohibition official and that his reputation in that respect in the department was of the highest. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF NATURALIZATION

Salaries: For the commissioner and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$113,000.

General expenses: For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of Labor, of officers, clerks, and employees appointed for the purpose of carrying on the work of the Bureau of Naturalization, as provided in the acts authorizing a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and establishing the Bureau of Naturalization, approved June 29, 1906, and March 4, 1913, and subsequent acts (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 351-416; U. S. C., Supp. III, title 8, secs. 355-384), including not to exceed \$156,920 for personal services in the District of Columbia; traveling expenses, including not to exceed \$400 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the naturalization of aliens when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor; street-car fare, telegrams, verifications of legal papers, telephone service in offices outside of the District of Columbia; necessary supplies and equipment for the Naturalization Service; not to exceed \$25,000 for rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia where suitable quarters can not be obtained in public buildings; and for mileage and fees to witnesses subpoenaed on behalf of the United States, the expenditures from this appropriation shall be made in the manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, \$1,043,970: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the compensation of assistants to clerks of United States courts.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When we reached this item in the appropriation bill last year I directed the attention of the chairman of the committee to the matter of the New York naturalization office, and I wish to ask the chairman at this time if he has any information regarding just how far behind that office is at the present time in the matter of the naturalization papers of aliens.

Mr. SHREVE. My recollection is that the officer in charge told us that they were very, very nearly current.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. May I say that at the increased price of \$20 for each naturalization final certificate the income upon 25,000 citizens' papers would run into quite a sum of money. There was a time some years ago, according to my information, that the New York office of the Naturalization Bureau was approximately 25,000 requests behind in its work.

Through the efficiency and tireless energy of the director of the New York office, Merton A. Sturgis, conditions there have been immeasurably improved. This splendid public servant, with his small staff, working in harmony, have brought about this salutary change. Last year when we had this bill before the House for consideration the distinguished chairman from Pennsylvania informed me that they had allocated an additional \$100,000 to the New York naturalization office. I am desirous of ascertaining what amount, if any, has been appropriated to that office in the present bill that will enable the director, Mr. Sturgis, to secure adequate help and bring the work up to date.

Mr. SHREVE. I think we have taken care of everything, because we have given them \$253,000 additional this year, and I think that will care for an increased number of clerks.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. That will help materially, and I am glad to have that assurance. This branch at New York as now conducted will bring large revenue to the Public Treasury, but adequate and competent help is essential and imperative in order to do so.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

To enable the Secretary of Labor to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, including juniors legally employed, to improve their working conditions, to advance their opportunities for profitable employment by regularly collecting, furnishing, and publishing employment information as to opportunities for employment; maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States; cooperating with and coordinating the public employment offices throughout the country, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; traveling expenses; supplies and equipment, telegraph and telephone service, and miscellaneous expenses; \$385,000,

of which amount not to exceed \$38,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the last paragraph, to strike out "\$385,000," in line 4, and insert "\$400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 116, line 4, strike out "\$385,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is a service that was set up during war times to assist men to find places of employment—to try to get the man to the job. It is used a great deal in connection with semi-migratory labor—is used year in and year out in all the cities, and is being used to the limit right now.

The appropriation is not enough, in my opinion. Here is another service that needs more money and the appropriation should be increased as the population increases. Just by way of illustration, to show how the system works, at the beginning of the hearings on certain bills that have been introduced to put the countries of this hemisphere on a quota basis, two gentlemen who live on the Rio Grande appeared and they made round statements as to the large number of Mexicans or people of that extraction that could be used in the development of the Rio Grande. One man said they needed labor in his town right now in considerable quantity. This was testified before the House Committee on Immigration. This gentleman gave us some figures. It seems that his chamber of commerce had sent to the United States agency for some labor. The district employment office, which is under the Department of Labor, sent 100 men up to that Texas town to get these jobs and they found out that just 25 men could be used. This was a week or so ago. The other 75 were left jobless in the town. The other man stated that in the county where he lives they needed a large amount of this labor right now, that the winter vegetables were growing and needed attention, and I think work on the cotton was about to start. I have forgotten the details, but at any rate they needed a lot of labor. His statement was printed widely. We started an inquiry through this very service, and found that 15,000 people from Mexico were without work and almost without food in that American town. Does anyone think this is a small problem?

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I understand this appropriation is increased \$160,000 for the next year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is good. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BACON. And does not the gentleman also realize that we have given Mr. Jones everything he has asked?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, the real asking has to start away back ahead of the making of the Annual Budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask to withdraw this amendment. I am not going to try to extract money from the Federal Treasury, no matter how important, when there are only nine Members on my side and less than a quorum in the Chamber. The Budget has got us. It fixes things for us. The Labor Department is a small one with limited personnel, and yet that personnel is spread all along both borders, and in all the States of the United States, with good executive heads, good stations, and a good system—as far as it goes. It deals with human beings; it can be of greater service. It is a small department. Any funds for it and its ever-increasing work look big, and the figures seem to frighten everybody.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from Washington has not given careful study to the matters for which he seeks increased appropriations. He has offered four amendments this afternoon, and I submit to the committee there is no merit in any amendment offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Except one. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The first amendment, since it involved a matter of bookkeeping, the transferring of \$500 from

one item to another item, the committee accepted. That is all it involved—not a dollar of increase in the appropriation. It will not improve in the slightest the efficiency of the service.

Then the gentleman undertook to increase another appropriation by \$2,000, and confessedly, when the facts were disclosed, he had not examined them, and that amendment was withdrawn.

Then he proposed an increase of \$100,000 under another item without knowledge that the committee had granted far more for that item than it had ever carried in the past.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? That is not a fair statement.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama (continuing). And then the Committee of the Whole, on the information submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and by the gentleman from Washington, voted on this amendment, with the result that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington received only 7 votes, I think, or perhaps 9, so the amendment failed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. To make it correct, it was 9.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This, it would seem, is a jury's verdict on the accuracy of the information advanced by the gentleman from Washington in support of increased appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman from Washington will admit that he offered two of the amendments in order to secure time to speak. The last one was offered for that purpose. We were about to rise. The gentleman from Washington contends that he knows exactly what the Budget was asked for with respect to border patrol and what was granted. So the charge that he is misinformed on that subject, to say the least, is unfair.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is a great pity the gentleman did not state it in such way as to carry some weight with the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I did say that the committee had added to the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Permit me to say that this bill, if subject to any criticism, is subject to the criticism that it carries for many items too liberal appropriation; but the committee, recognizing that business conditions were not satisfactory, and that the Chief Executive occupied a position that enabled him to carefully survey and evaluate the business requirements of these departments, gave approval to the President's recommendations, though in some instances we felt they were very liberal, probably too liberal.

I repeat, if this bill which you will vote on in a few minutes is subject to any criticism—that criticism is that it carries for some items too large an appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Washington having five additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my time all through this debate has been limited. And the printed hearings are compressed—few pages, and worth reading. I undertook to say earlier in the afternoon frankly that this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee had made increases almost all along the line for the Department of Labor. I did not attempt to read the actual increases from this table which is attached to the hearings. I do have the facts; I think I stated them correctly. I admit that I offered two amendments for the express purpose of securing limited time to speak, hoping that I might inform the Committee of the Whole House for the future. I am right when I stated that this Department of Labor is struggling to make things go. The whole Immigration Service is in one lump sum, of \$8,800,000. Since I have been in Congress I have seen it climb from \$3,000,000. I have seen Immigration drop from a net of 1,000,000 a year to a net of 300,000 a year. I have seen deportations increased from 3,000 a year to more than 12,000 a year. It has been worth the fight.

I have tried to proceed to-day without criticizing the committee of 35 members, or any of the subcommittees. This bill appropriates for four departments. If I had the time, I would state just how the estimates go up from the departments to the Bureau of the Budget, what the instructions are for the approaching year as compared with the dying year, and the whole

system, and why most bureau chiefs speak softly before the appropriations subcommittees.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry and I feel hurt to think that in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union a Member can not endeavor to present matters before the membership of the committee without having himself criticized severely at the last moment for trying to furnish information which is not so easy to obtain. It seems to me that the Labor Department has a great deal more than it can do if it spends every dollar that it can get. Almost every spring along many lines, particularly deportation, the department has to slow down and mark time while waiting for appropriations that will become effective July 1.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8960) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 36, line 10, strike out "\$203,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$303,600."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 4, noes 70.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] It is evident that there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absentees. The Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken; and there were—yeas 21, nays 292, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—21

Andresen	Johnson, Tex.	Maas	Schafer, Wis.
Black	Jones, Tex.	Patman	Stafford
Cooper, Wis.	Kading	Patterson	Welch, Calif.
Green	Kvale	Peavey	
Howard	LaGuardia	Pittenger	
Hull, Wis.	Lampert	Rankin	

NAYS—292

Abernethy	Blackburn	Canfield	Cooper, Ohio
Ackerman	Bland	Cannon	Cooper, Tenn.
Adkins	Bloom	Carter, Calif.	Corning
Aldrich	Bohn	Cartwright	Cox
Allen	Bolton	Chalmers	Coyle
Allgood	Bowman	Chindblom	Craddock
Almon	Box	Clague	Cramton
Andrew	Brand, Ga.	Clancy	Crisp
Arnold	Briggs	Clark, Md.	Crosser
Auf der Heide	Browne	Clark, N. C.	Culkin
Ayres	Browning	Clarke, N. Y.	Cullen
Bacharach	Brumm	Cochran, Mo.	Dallinger
Bachmann	Brunner	Cochran, Pa.	Davenport
Bacon	Buchanan	Collier	Davis
Bankhead	Buckbee	Collins	Dempsey
Barbour	Burtness	Colton	De Priest
Beedy	Butler	Connery	DeRouen
Beers	Byrns	Connolly	Dominick
Bell	Campbell, Iowa	Cooke	Doughton

Dowell
Drewry
Driver
Dunbar
Dyer
Eaton, Colo.
Eaton, N. J.
Edwards
Elliott
Eslick
Esterly
Evans, Calif.
Fenn
Fish
Fisher
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fort
Frear
Freeman
French
Fulmer
Garber, Okla.
Garber, Va.
Garner
Gasque
Gavagan
Gibson
Gifford
Glover
Glynn
Graham
Gregory
Griffin
Guyer
Hadley
Hale
Hall, Ill.
Hall, Ind.
Hall, Miss.
Hall, N. Dak.
Halsey
Hammer
Hancock
Hardy
Hare
Hartley
Hastings
Hess
Hickey
Hill, Wash.
Hoffman
Hogg
Holaday

Hooper
Hope
Hopkins
Houston, Del.
Huddleston
Hudson
Hull, Morton D.
Hull, Tenn.
Irwin
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Wash.
Johnston, Mo.
Kahn
Kelly
Kemp
Kendall, Pa.
Kerr
Ketcham
Kieffer
Kincheloe
Knutson
Kopp
Korell
Kunz
Langley
Lankford, Ga.
Lankford, Va.
Larsen
Leavitt
Lee, Tex.
Leech
Lehlbach
Letts
Linthicum
Luce
Ludlow
McClintic, Okla.
McClintock, Ohio
McCormack, Mass.
McDuffie
McFadden
McKeown
McLaughlin
McLeod
McMillan
McReynolds
Manlove
Mansfield
Mapes
Martin
Menges
Michaelson

Michener
Miller
Milligan
Montague
Montet
Mooney
Moore, Ky.
Moore, Ohio
Morehead
Morgan
Mouser
Nelson, Me.
Nelson, Mo.
Newhall
Niedringhaus
Nolan
Norton
O'Connell, N. Y.
O'Connell, R. I.
O'Connor, Okla.
Oldfield
Oliver, Ala.
Oliver, N. Y.
Owen
Palmer
Palmisano
Parker
Parks
Perkins
Prall
Pratt, Ruth
Quin
Ragon
Rainey, Henry T.
Ramseyer
Ramspeck
Ransley
Rayburn
Reed, N. Y.
Reid, Ill.
Robinson
Rogers
Romjue
Rowbottom
Rutherford
Sanders, N. Y.
Sanders, Tex.
Sandlin
Schneider
Sears
Seger
Shaffer, Va.
Short, Mo.
Shott, W. Va.

Shreve
Simmons
Sinclair
Sloan
Smith, Idaho
Smith, W. Va.
Snell
Snow
Sparks
Speaks
Sproul, Ill.
Stalker
Stone
Strong, Kans.
Strong, Pa.
Summers, Wash.
Sumners, Tex.
Swanson
Taber
Tarver
Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Thatcher
Thompson
Thurston
Tilson
Tinkham
Tucker
Turpin
Underhill
Vestal
Vincent, Mich.
Vinson, Ga.
Wainwright
Walker
Warren
Wason
Watres
Watson
Welsh, Pa.
White
Whitehead
Whitley
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williamson
Wilson
Wingo
Wolverton, N. J.
Wolverton, W. Va.
Woodrum
Wright
Wyant
Yon

NOT VOTING—114

Arentz
Aswell
Baird
Beck
Boylan
Brand, Ohio
Brigham
Britten
Burdick
Busby
Cable
Campbell, Pa.
Carley
Carter, Wyo.
Celler
Chase
Christgau
Christopherson
Cole
Crall
Cross
Crowther
Curry
Darrow
Denison
Dickinson
Dickstein
Douglass, Ariz.
Douglass, Mass.

Doutrich
Doxey
Doyle
Drane
Ellis
Englebright
Estep
Evans, Mont.
Foss
Free
Fuller
Gambrell
Garrett
Golder
Goldsborough
Goodwin
Greenwood
Haugen
Hawley
Hill, Ala.
Hoch
Hudspeth
Hughes
Hull, William E.
Igoe
James
Jeffers
Jenkins
Johnson, Ind.

Johnson, Nebr.
Johnson, S. Dak.
Jonas, N. C.
Kearns
Kendall, Ky.
Kurtz
Lambertson
Lanham
Lea, Calif.
Lindsay
Lozier
McCloskey
McCormick, Ill.
McSwain
Magrady
Mead
Merritt
Moore, Va.
Murphy
Nelson, Wis.
O'Connor, La.
O'Connor, N. Y.
Porter
Pou
Pratt, Harcourt J.
Pritchard
Purnell
Quayle
Ramey, Frank M.

Reece
Sabath
Seiberling
Selvig
Simms
Sirovich
Somers, N. Y.
Spearing
Sproul, Kans.
Stegall
Stedman
Stevenson
Stobbs
Sullivan, N. Y.
Sullivan, Pa.
Swick
Swing
Taylor, Colo.
Timberlake
Treadway
Underwood
Williams
Wolfenden
Wood
Woodruff
Yates
Zelman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Darrow with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Purnell with Mr. Mead.
Mr. Frank M. Ramey with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Denison with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Moore of Virginia.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Garrett.
Mr. Free with Mr. Drane.
Mr. Golder with Mr. Spearing.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Swick with Mr. Aswell.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Doxey.
Mr. Harcourt J. Pratt with Mr. Hill of Alabama.
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Swing with Mr. Stedman.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. Treadway with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hawley with Mr. Carley.
Mr. Magrady with Mr. Busby.
Mr. Reece with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Gambrell.

Mr. Burdick with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Crail with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Wolfenden with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Igoe.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Lozier.
Mr. Foss with Mr. Steagall.
Mr. Englebright with Mr. Lea of California.
Mr. Curry with Mr. Greenwood.
Mr. Beck with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mrs. McCormick of Illinois with Mr. Jeffers.
Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Selvig with Mr. Evans of Montana.
Mr. Timberlake with Mr. O'Connor of Louisiana.
Mr. James with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Estep with Mr. Goldsborough.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SHREVE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GOOD ROADS

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5616, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5616, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. DOWELL, Mr. BRAND of Ohio, and Mr. ALMON.

ATTENDANCE AT STATE FAIRS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Record a brief statement made by myself in respect to attendance at State fairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 27 a statement by my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], as follows:

On the 16th day of December, 1929, in a speech delivered on the floor of the House relative to Nebraska's diamond jubilee, I made the statement that Nebraska had a larger attendance at its State fair than any other State. The statement was challenged by my friend, honorable Mr. KNOTSON, of Minnesota, whose State had heretofore led in State-fair attendance. I have taken time and opportunity to verify the correctness of my statement of leadership and the following figures fairly support my general statement then made. The attendance for the years 1928 and 1929 at the leading State fairs are as follows, arranged in the order of the State's rank in 1929.

This was followed by a list of fairs with their respective attendances for the years 1928 and 1929.

My friend overlooked including the attendance of the Texas State Fair which is held at Dallas, and for the purpose of making his data more comprehensive I take the liberty of adding to the figures given, those showing the attendance at the Dallas fair during those years. The data as corrected would be as follows:

	1928	1929
Nebraska State Fair.....	427,034	437,660
Ohio State Fair.....	338,587	437,000
Minnesota State Fair.....	457,212	433,268
Iowa State Fair.....	367,226	432,257
Kansas State Fair.....	350,000	350,000
Illinois State Fair.....	331,000	330,900
Missouri State Fair.....	235,075	281,992
Wisconsin State Fair.....	267,471	272,411
Indiana State Fair.....	254,587	245,194
New York State Fair.....	225,913	235,996
Michigan State Fair.....	232,388	196,400
Oklahoma State Fair.....	260,449	145,000
Texas State Fair.....	1,011,265	963,566

It will be noted that the attendance last year was only 963,566. This resulted from a curtailment on account of very severe weather during a part of the period in which the fair was being held. The attendance during 1927 was just a little above the attendance of 1928, the attendance for 1927 being 1,028,317.

This is not a remarkable attendance, everything considered, because the Dallas State Fair is perhaps the greatest annual exposition in the world. I am glad to make this contribution toward having my friend's figures more comprehensive and exact.

JOHN KERRIGAN, SAMUEL KURZMAN, WILLIAM BENENKE, AND ONE ENGLEBERG

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and at the request of the chairman of that committee, I submit a privileged report from that committee, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 130

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the Speaker of the House with answers to the following queries:

1. What was the report of the investigation of the Treasury Department on which the employment of the following-named prohibition agents in New York City was based: John Kerrigan, Samuel Kurzman, William Benenke, and one Engleberg?

2. Were the above-named agents recommended for employment by the Prohibition Bureau by Samuel S. Koenig, Republican leader of New York County, and who were the other indorsers of their character and fitness?

3. Were any of the above-named agents dismissed from the Treasury service, and reports on which said dismissals were based?

4. Have any agents been appointed in the Prohibition Unit who have had police records?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is an adverse report, and therefore I move that the resolution do lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

BOARD OF VISITORS, NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Under authority of section 1081, title 34, of the United States Code, the Chair appoints the following Members to the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota; Mr. C. ELLIS MOORE, of Ohio; Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT, of New York; Mr. JOHN M. EVANS, of Montana; and Mr. WILLIAM A. AYRES, of Kansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIROVICH for two weeks on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, January 30, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 30, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m. and 2 p. m.)

District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Deficiency appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the appropriation of the sum of \$871,655 as the contribution of the United States toward the Christopher Columbus Memorial Lighthouse at Santo Domingo (H. J. Res. 5.)

To provide for the determination of claims for damages sustained by the fluctuation of the water levels of the Lake of the Woods in certain cases (H. R. 5051).

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—SUBCOMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND BANKING

(10 a. m.—Room 452)

To authorize fraternal and benevolent corporations heretofore created by special act of Congress to divide and separate the

insurance activities from the fraternal activities by an act of its supreme legislative body, subject to the approval of the superintendent of insurance of the District of Columbia (H. R. 7701).

To provide a code of insurance law for the District of Columbia (excepting marine insurance as now provided for by the act of March 4, 1922, and fraternal and benevolent insurance associations or orders as provided for by the acts of March 3, 1897, June 30, 1902, May 29, 1928, December 12, 1928, and December 20, 1928) (H. R. 3941).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the United States Naval Hospital, Washington, D. C. (H. R. 8866).

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider bills concerning aliens from countries of the Western Hemisphere immigrating to the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BEERS: Committee on Printing. H. Res. 119. A resolution to provide for the reprinting of House Document No. 132, Seventy-first Congress, being a letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a report covering the selection of locations deemed most suitable for a naval airship base (Rept. No. 550). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8712. A bill to legalize a combined sewer and submarine cable constructed under the Grand River near the pumping station on Market Avenue at Grand Rapids, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 551). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLTON: Committee on Roads. H. R. 7585. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2156. A bill authorizing the sale of all of the interest and rights of the United States of America in the Columbia Arsenal property, situated in the ninth civil district of Maury County, Tenn.; and providing that the net fund be deposited in the military post construction fund, and for the repeal of Public Law No. 542 (H. R. 12479), Seventieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8162. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to repeal and reenact chapter 100, 1914, Public, No. 108, to provide for the restoration of Fort McHenry, in the State of Maryland, and its permanent preservation as a national park and perpetual national memorial shrine as the birthplace of the immortal Star Spangled Banner, written by Francis Scott Key for the appropriation of the necessary funds, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925; without amendment (Rept. No. 559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LINTHICUM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9110. A bill for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 742. A bill to prevent desecration of the flag and insignia of the United States and to provide punishment therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9059. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late Frank J. Simmons; without amendment (Rept. No. 552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9174. A bill for the relief of Frank W. Tucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 396. A bill for the relief of J. H. Muus; without amendment (Rept. No. 554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DARROW: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 8489. A bill for the relief of William C. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JAMES: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1099. A bill to place a retired officer of the Army on the retired list as a major general; without amendment (Rept. No. 557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 130. A resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Treasury; adverse (Rept. No. 562). Laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3155) granting a pension to Montie Johnson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8583) for the relief of the State of Maine; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9118) granting a pension to Beulah R. Hemphill; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 9297) to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 9298) to prevent disclosure of confidential information the physician receives from the patient for whom medicinal liquor is prescribed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 9299) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PITTENGER: A bill (H. R. 9300) to authorize the Postmaster General to hire vehicles from village delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 9301) to provide for the relinquishment by the United States of a certain tract of land to the borough of Stonington, in the county of New London, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 9302) for the establishment of a United States industrial reformatory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 9303) to authorize funds for the construction of a building at Corozal, Canal Zone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 9304) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 9305) to construct a tunnel under the Delaware River between the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9306) to authorize per capita payments to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9307) to create a commission to investigate the issuance of fee simple patents to Indians not applying therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 9308) crediting certain employees with time served as employees of third-class post offices for the purposes of the civil service retirement laws; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for eradication of pink bollworm and authorizing an

appropriation therefor," approved May 21, 1928; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 139) that a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations be designated to hold hearings relative to the Mediterranean fruit fly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN: Memorial of the house of representatives, Commonwealth of Kentucky, urging a change in the so-called adjusted service certificate law so that these certificates may be payable at once; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 9309) granting a pension to Robert Gross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9310) granting a pension to Dexter Aldrich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9311) granting a pension to Oscar T. Ginn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 9312) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Garfield Fox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 9313) granting a pension to Louisa H. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9314) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie R. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTLEY: A bill (H. R. 9315) granting a pension to Adam Frommer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9316) granting a pension to Teresa Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9317) granting a pension to Charles B. Mullin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 9318) granting an increase of pension to Mattie C. Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9319) granting an increase of pension to Ida H. Trimble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9320) granting a pension to Mahala Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9321) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to James Robert Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 9322) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Hanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 140) to certify Nicholas Casale to be the smallest fighting soldier in the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3750. By Mr. ACKERMAN: Petition from the Quincy O'M. Gillmore Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, E. M. Andrews, commander, urging the enactment of House bill 2562, granting an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3751. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of sundry citizens of Estill County, Ky., urging the passage of legislation praying for increased pensions to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3752. By Mr. BRUNNER: Petition of L. M. Hartruet and 50 or more citizens of the second (Queensboro) New York district, urging Congress to pass favorably upon Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, to increase pensions of Spanish-War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3753. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of George Buel and 76 other residents of Mendota, Ill., asking for early passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to Spanish-War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3754. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of certain citizens of Crook County, Oreg., praying for increase of pensions to veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

3755. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition signed by residents of Toledo, Ohio, urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of all Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3756. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of Nelson P. Bonney and 177 citizens of Chenango County, N. Y., asking support of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, increasing pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3757. Also, petition of Frank M. Winchell and 71 citizens of Delaware County, N. Y., asking support of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, increasing pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3758. Also, petition of Thomas S. Scott and 64 citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., asking support of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, increasing pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3759. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of citizens of Lynn, Mass., asking for increase in pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3760. Also, petition of citizens of Peabody, Mass., asking for increase in pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3761. By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of Paul B. Hof and 30 other indorsers urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3762. By Mr. FREE: Petition of Isabel C. Smith, of Palo Alto, Calif., and 71 residents of Santa Clara County, Calif., urging passage of legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3763. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Shawnee Lions Club, Shawnee, Okla., fully indorsing Senate bill 2819, to create a department of welfare for the blind in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

3764. Also, petition of mayor and general council of the city of Atlanta, Ga., urging enactment into legislation of House bill 2562, granting pensions and certain increases in pensions to soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

3765. Also, petition of Independent Petroleum Association of America, Ardmore, Okla., urging indorsement of Senate bill 1752; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3766. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Jesse F. Nelson and 23 other citizens of McCracken County, Ky., urging the passage of a bill granting increased pension to veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3767. Also, petition of Ira D. Tucker and 22 other citizens of Dublin, Graves County, Ky., urging the speedy consideration and passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3768. By Mr. HUGHES: Petition signed by citizens of Parkersburg and vicinity, and submitted by Warren M. Koon, in which they urge that the Congress of the United States take immediate steps to bring to a vote Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3769. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by citizens of Lawrence County, Ohio, urging Members of Congress to use every endeavor to secure speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3770. By Mr. HAMMER: Petition of 15 citizens of Union County, N. C., urging more liberal pension legislation for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3771. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by citizens of Oak Hill, Ohio, urging Members of Congress to use every endeavor to secure speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3772. Also, petition signed by citizens of Proctorville, Ohio, urging Members of Congress to use every endeavor to secure speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

3773. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Paul M. Humble, post commander, Sim Ashburn Post, No. 88, American Legion, Groesbeck, Tex., favoring House Joint Resolution 220; to the Committee on Rules.

3774. By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: Petition of the citizens of Breathitt County, Ky., submitted by Matt J. Long, Elkatawa, Ky., in which they urge that the House and Senate pass Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562 at an early date; to the Committee on Pensions.

3775. By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Petition of T. R. Steele, 150 Maple Terrace, Portsmouth, Va., and others, asking speedy consideration of and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3776. Also, petition of David R. Woodington, 816 Thayer Street, Norfolk, Va., and others, asking speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3777. Also, petition of M. E. Scott, 3217 Somme Avenue, Norfolk, Va., and others, asking speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3778. Also, petition of Samuel Harrell, of 1012 Edlingham Street, Portsmouth, Va., and George Tynes, of 648 North Street, Portsmouth, Va., asking speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3779. Also, petition of J. W. Holland, 207 Court Street, Portsmouth, Va., and others, asking speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3780. Also, petition of G. W. Hilton, route 2, box 96, Portsmouth, Va., and others, asking speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rate of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3781. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of John Tork and other citizens of Davenport, Iowa, urging the passage of pension legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3782. Also, petition of Jesse L. Doty and other citizens of Davenport, Iowa, urging the passage of pension legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3783. Also, petition of W. L. Bowers and other citizens of Davenport, Iowa, urging the passage of pension legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3784. Also, petition of Ed. M. Kurtz and other citizens of Davenport, Iowa, urging the passage of pension legislation in behalf of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3785. By Mr. MCCLINTOCK of Ohio: Petition of 2,000 members of the Moose Lodge of Canton, Ohio, favoring increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3786. By Mr. MENGES: Petition presented by John D. Ferree and other citizens of York County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, which provide increased rates of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3787. By Mr. MOUSER: Petitions of citizens of Findlay, Van Buren, North Baltimore, and Rawson, Ohio, asking passage of the Spanish-American War pension bill known, as the Knutson bill (H. R. 2562); to the Committee on Pensions.

3788. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of William Henry Baumann, president of the Continental Mortgage Guarantee Co., of New York City, opposing the passage of House bill 8634, providing for the establishment in the Department of the Treasury of a Federal building loan board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3789. By Mrs. OLDFIELD: Petition of C. M. Hanshaw and other citizens of Independence and Izard Counties, Ark., urging additional pension legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.

3790. By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition signed by Carson T. Metcalf and 67 other citizens of Greene County, Ill., protesting against taking radio station KWKH, of Shreveport, La., off the air; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3791. Also, petition signed by James Bowie and 171 other citizens of Carrollton, Greene County, Ill., protesting against taking radio station KWKH, Shreveport, La., off the air; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3792. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition signed by E. C. Russell, of 791 Nevada Street, Dubuque, Iowa, and 30 other citizens of Dubuque, Iowa, urging the passage of legislation which will increase the rates of pensions of the Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3793. By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of 69 citizens of Clearwater, Ewing, and Inman, Nebr., asking for speedy consideration and passage of pending bills providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3794. By Mr. SPEAKS: Petition signed by 15 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging support of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3795. Also, petition signed by 51 citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging support of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

3796. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of citizens of Hancock, Md., urging immediate and favorable action on House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476, providing for increased rates of pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, January 30, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	George	Kean	Sheppard
Baird	Gillett	Kendrick	Shipstead
Barkley	Glass	Keyes	Shortridge
Bingham	Glenn	La Follette	Simmons
Black	Goff	McKellar	Smith
Blease	Goldsborough	McMaster	Smoot
Borah	Gould	McNary	Steiwer
Bratton	Greene	Metcalf	Sullivan
Brookhart	Grundey	Moses	Swanson
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Harris	Norris	Townsend
Connally	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Copeland	Hastings	Oddie	Tydings
Couzens	Hatfield	Overman	Vandenberg
Cutting	Hawes	Patterson	Wagner
Deneen	Hebert	Phipps	Walcott
Dill	Hedlin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Fess	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Frazier	Jones	Robison, Ky.	Wheeler

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] are absent on business of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is also detained from the Senate by illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GOULD presented a petition of sundry citizens of Blaine and Mars Hill, in the State of Maine, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newark and vicinity, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented a memorial of members of the Brown Memorial Presbyterian Church, of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against any revision of the existing calendar unless a proviso be included definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of blank days, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NYE presented 62 resolutions adopted by branches of the North Dakota Federation of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring the prompt ratification of the proposed World Court protocol, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Detroit, Mich., favoring the pas-

sage of legislation designating October 11 as a memorial day for Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Lodge No. 8, International Shipmasters' Association of the Great Lakes at Marine City, and Harbor No. 14, International Shipmasters' Association of the Great Lakes, at St. Clair, in the State of Michigan, protesting against the passage of legislation to provide for the establishment of shipping commissioners at ports on the Great Lakes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from the Chamber of Commerce, of Menominee, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of legislation to provide for the establishment of shipping commissioners at ports on the Great Lakes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FAMINE CONDITIONS IN CHINA

Mr. HARRIS. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from Claude L. Whaley, president of the Macon (Ga.) Kiwanis Club, urging the Government to give relief to famine conditions in China, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

MACON, GA., January 15, 1930.

Senator W. J. HARRIS,
Washington, D. C.:

Kiwanis Club of Macon by resolution to-day respectfully urge our Government to take immediately every possible step to assist in alleviating appalling famine conditions in China. Feel sure you will use the power of your high office at once to the end that human beings may not perish from hunger. This club stands ready to assist in any way it can.

CLAUDE L. WHALEY,
President Macon Kiwanis Club.

OIL AND COAL LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent to present, in the nature of a petition or memorial, a resolution passed by the Commercial Club of Ketchikan, Alaska, with regard to changing the laws relating to coal and oil lands in Alaska. As it is brief and important, I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and printed at the proper place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA, February 8, 1929.

CHAIRMAN SENATE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This club has given study to and has indorsed the following resolution which originated with and was adopted by the Cordova (Alaska) Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting on December 7, 1928.

"Resolved, That it is for the greatest good of the Territory of Alaska, and it is absolutely necessary to its development, that all leasing laws relating to oil or coal lands and the act of Congress of 1912 relating to placer ground be repealed, and that the Territory of Alaska be again placed under the former laws relating to the acquisition of public lands for mining use under which the western part of the United States has been developed and made populous and prosperous."

Yours respectfully,

COMMERCIAL CLUB OF KETCHIKAN,
By FRANK S. SHELTON, Secretary.

REFERENCE OF CERTAIN PAPERS

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented papers to accompany the bill (S. 2877) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way for street purposes upon and across the Holabird Quartermaster Depot Military Reservation, in the State of Maryland, heretofore introduced by him, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2878) to authorize Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, and Brig. Gen. William H. Welch, Auxiliary Officers' Reserve Corps, to accept the awards of the French Legion of Honor, heretofore introduced by him, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.